arXiv:1101.5515v2 [math.PR] 12 Jul 2011

LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR STOCHASTIC INTEGRALS AND STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS DRIVEN BY INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL SEMIMARTINGALES

By Arnab Ganguly*

ETH Zurich

The paper deals with the large deviation principle for a sequence of stochastic integrals and stochastic differential equations in infinite-dimensional settings. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space. We consider a sequence of stochastic integrals $\{X_{n-} \cdot Y_n\}$, where $\{Y_n\}$ is a sequence of infinite-dimensional semimartingales indexed by $\mathbb{H} \times [0, \infty)$ and the X_n are $\mathbb{H}$-valued cadlag processes. Assuming that $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle, a uniform exponential tightness condition is described under which a large deviation principle holds for $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$. An expression for the rate function of the sequence of stochastic integrals $\{X_{n-} \cdot Y_n\}$ is given in terms of the rate function of $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$. A similar result for stochastic differential equations also holds. Since many Markov processes can be represented as solutions of stochastic differential equations, these results, in particular, provide a new approach to the study of large deviation principle for a sequence of Markov processes.

1. Introduction.

The theory of large deviations is roughly the study of the exponential decay of the probability measures of certain kinds of extreme or tail events (see [7] for some general principles of this theory). More precisely, as formulated by Varadhan [35], the large deviation principle for a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu_n\}$ is defined as follows:

Definition 1.1. *Let U be a regular Hausdorff topological space and $\{\mu_n\}$ a sequence of probability measures on $(U, \mathcal{U})$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a σ-algebra on U (typically the Borel σ-algebra). $\{\mu_n\}$ satisfies a* **large deviation principle** *(LDP) with rate function $I : U \to [0, \infty)$, if*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu_n(O) \geq -I(O), \quad \textit{for every open set } \; O \in \mathcal{U}$$

and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu_n(C) \leq -I(C), \quad \textit{for every closed set } \; C.$$

Here for a set A, $I(A) = \inf_{x\in A} I(x)$.

The rate function I is generally taken to be lower semicontinuous, and under that condition it is unique. Much of the earlier work on the large deviation principle (Freidlin and Wentzell [36],

---

*Research supported in part by NSF grants DMS 05-53687 and 08-05793

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 60F10, 60H05, 60H10, 60J05, 60J25

Keywords and phrases: large deviations, stochastic integration, stochastic differential equation, exponential tightness, uniform exponential tightness, Markov processe infinite dimensional semimartingales, Banach space-valued semimartingales

Donsker and Varadhan [9, 10]) was based on change of measure techniques, where a new measure is identified under which the events of interest have high probability, and then the probability of that event under the original probability measure is calculated using the Radon-Nikodym derivative.

An approach analogous to the Prohorov compactness approach to weak convergence has been developed by Puhalskii [28], O'Brien and Vervaat [27], de Acosta [6]. The proof of weak convergence typically involves verification of *tightness* of the sequence. A similar role is played by the *exponential tightness* condition in the 'weak convergence approach' to large deviation theory.

Definition 1.2. *Let U be a regular Hausdorff topological space and $\{\mu_n\}$ a sequence of probability measures on $(U,\mathcal{U})$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a σ-algebra on U containing all the compact subsets of U. $\{\mu_n\}$ is* **exponentially tight** *if for every $a > 0$, there exists a compact set K_a such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mu_n(K_a^c) \leq -a.$$

Puhalskii [28] (and in more general settings, O'Brien and Vervaat [27] and de Acosta [6]) showed that exponential tightness implies existence of a large deviation principle along a subsequence (see Theorem 3.7 of [13]). For a sequence of processes $\{X_n\}$ in $D_U[0,\infty)$, verification of exponential tightness is sometimes done by first showing that the sequence satisfies the *exponential compact containment condition* (see Chapter 4, [13]).

Definition 1.3. *Let E be a complete and separable metric space. A sequence $\{X_n\}$ satisfies the* **exponential compact containment condition** *if for each $a, T > 0$, there exists a compact set $C_{a,T} \subset E$ such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P(X_n(t) \notin C_{a,T} \quad \textit{for some } t \leq T) \leq -a.$$

Many techniques were developed to follow the 'weak convergence approach' for proving large deviation principles. Dupuis and Ellis [11] used weak convergence methods to identify the limit of

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log \int e^{-nh(x)} d\mu_n = \inf \left[\int_U h \, d\nu + \frac{1}{n} R(\nu|\mu_n) \right], \tag{1.1}$$

where the infimum on the right side is taken over all probability mesures on U, and $R(\nu|\mu_n)$ denotes the relative entropy of ν with respect to μ_n. The necessary weak convergence was achieved after the right side of (1.1) was interpreted as the minimal cost function of a stochastic optimal control problem. Connection between control problems and large deviation results was originally due to Fleming [14, 15]. For a sequence of Markov processes, Feng and Kurtz [13] used convergence of the corresponding sequence of nonlinear semigroups to prove the desired large deviation results. The required convergence of nonlinear semigroups was achieved using tools of viscosity solutions for nonlinear equations. This approach is similar in idea to that of using convergence of the operator semigroups to prove weak convergence of Markov processes (Ethier and Kurtz [12]).

Many Markov processes can be represented as solutions of stochastic differential equations. Depending on the problem, the corresponding integrators can be either finite-dimensional semimartingales or infinite-dimensional semimartingales. Such representations suggest that an approach to large deviations of Markov processes would be through the study of large deviation principle for the solutions of the corresponding stochastic differential equations. The technique mentioned is much in the same spirit as the technique of using stochastic equations for proving weak convergence of Markov processes (see Ethier and Kurtz [12]). The central goal in such a large deviation theory of stochastic differential equations would be to find conditions, which would ensure that if $\{(X_n(0), Y_n)\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle, then a large deviation principle also holds for $\{X_n\}$, where $\{X_n\}$ satisfies

$$X_n = X_n(0) + F(X_{n-}) \cdot Y_n.$$

The first step in this approach is to find conditions on the sequence $\{Y_n\}$, such that a large deviation principle holds for the sequence of stochastic integrals $\{X_{n-} \cdot Y_n\}$, whenever it does for the pair $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$. Note that there does not exist a continuous function f such that $X_- \cdot Y = f(X, Y)$. Hence, the contraction principle cannot be used to arrive at the required large deviation principle.

For finite-dimensional processes, a *uniform exponential tightness* condition on the sequence $\{Y_n\}$ was given in Garcia [18] which yields the desired result. The idea of the *uniform exponential tightnes* is suggested by the *uniform tightnes* condition used by Jakubowski, Meḿin and Pagès [23] to prove weak convergence results for a sequence of stochastic integrals. A precise statement of Garcia's theorem (Theorem 1.2, [18]) is given below.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a uniformly exponentially tight sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted real-valued semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted real-valued cadlag processes. If $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with a rate function I, then so does the tuple $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ with the rate function J given by*

$$J(x, y, z) \quad = \begin{cases} I(x, y), & z = x \cdot y, \ y \text{ finite variation}, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

Here $x \cdot y(t) \equiv \lim_{\|\sigma\| \to 0} x(t_i)(y(t_{i+1}) - y(t_i))$, where $\sigma = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots, t_n = t\}$ is a partition of the interval $[0, t)$ and $\|\sigma\| \equiv \max_i(t_i - t_{i-1})$ is the mesh of the partition σ.

A similar result for stochastic differential equations has also been proved.

In this paper, we extend these results to a sequence of stochastic integrals and stochastic differential equations driven by a sequence of infinite-dimensional semimartingales. The infinite-dimensional semimartingales considered are the $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales [24]. Specific examples of them include space-time Gaussian white noise and Poisson random measures. A brief introduction to $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales is given in Chapter 2. We first generalize the notion of uniform tightness to a sequence of $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales (Definition 3.1). Theorem 1.4 is then extended first to finite-dimensional stochastic integrals driven by $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales (see Theorem 4.15) and later to infinite-dimensional stochastic integrals (Theorem 4.20). Identification of the rate function of $\{X_{n-} \cdot Y_n\}$ in terms of the rate function of (X_n, Y_n) was the biggest challenge in this infinite-dimensional setting, and that has been done by identifying an appropriate *pseudo-basis* of the Banach space $\mathbb{H}$. The required tools from the basis theory of Banach spaces have been collected in the Appendix. Finally, a large deviation principle has been proved for solutions of a sequence of stochastic differential equations (Theorem 5.1 in Chapter 5), and many examples are given illustrating the usefulness of this new approach.

2. Infinite-dimensional semimartingales. Infinite-dimensional stochastic analysis is an active research area and depending on the need, different types of infinite-dimensional semimartingales are used in the modelling. A few popular notions of infinite-dimensional semimartingales include *orthogonal martingale random measure* [19], *worthy martingale random measures* [37], *Banach space-valued semimartingales* [26], *nuclear space-valued semimartingales* [34]. In [24], Kurtz and Protter introduced the notion of *standard* $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale where $\mathbb{H}$ is a Banach Space and developed stochastic integrals in that context. *Standard* $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales form a very general class of infinite-dimensional semimartingales which includes *Banach space valued-semimartingales, cylindrical Brownian motion* and most semimartingale random measures. In particular, they cover the two most important and interesting cases: space-time Gaussian white noise and Poisson random measures. It is this class of semimartingales which we work with in this paper. Below we give a brief outline of $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales.

2.1. $\mathbb{H}^\#$-*semimartingale.*

Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space.

Definition 2.1. *An $\mathbb{R}$-valued stochastic process Y indexed by $\mathbb{H}\times[0,\infty)$ is an $\mathbb{H}^\#$*-**semimartingale** *with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ if*

- *for each $h \in \mathbb{H}$, $Y(h,\cdot)$ is a cadlag $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$-semimartingale, with $Y(h,0)=0$.*
- *for each $t>0$, $h_1,\dots,h_m \in \mathbb{H}$ and $a_1,\dots,a_m \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$Y(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i, t) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i Y(h_i,t) \quad a.s.$$

As in almost all integration theory, the first step is to define the stochastic integral in a canonical way for simple functions and then to extend it to a broader class of integrands.

Let Z be an $\mathbb{H}$-valued cadlag process of the form

$$Z(t) = \sum_{k=1}^m \xi_k(t) h_k, \tag{2.1}$$

where the ξ_k are $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ adapted real valued cadlag processes, and $h_1,\dots,h_k \in \mathbb{H}$.
The stochastic integral $Z_- \cdot Y$ is defined as

$$Z_- \cdot Y(t) = \sum_{k=1}^m \int_0^t \xi_k(s-) dY(h_k,s).$$

Note that the integral above is just a real valued process. It is necessary to impose more conditions on the $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale to broaden the class of integrands Z.
Let $\mathcal{S}_t$ be the collection of all processes of the form (2.1) with $\sup_{s\le t}\|Z(s)\| \le 1$. Define

$$\mathcal{H}_t = \left\{ \sup_{s\le t} |Z_- \cdot Y(s)| : Z \in \mathcal{S}_t \right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Definition 2.2. *An $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale Y is* **standard** *if for each $t>0$, $\mathcal{H}_t$ is stochastically bounded, that is for every $t>0$ and $\epsilon>0$ there exists $k(t,\epsilon)$ such that*

$$P\left[\sup_{s\le t}|Z_-\cdot Y(s)| \ge k(t,\epsilon)\right] \le \epsilon,$$

for all $Z \in \mathcal{S}_t$.

2.2. *Integration with respect to a standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale.*

Let X be an $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$-adapted $\mathbb{H}$-valued cadlag process. We review the techniques of approximation of X by simple functions of the form (2.1) from [24] as they are used in Section 4. The following lemma on partition of unity (Lemma 3.1, [24]) is needed for the construction. For a topological space S, let $C_b(S)$ denote the space of continuous and bounded real-valued functions on S with the sup norm.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (S,d) be a complete, separable metric space and $\{\phi_k\}$ a countable dense subset of S. Then for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence $\{\psi_k^\epsilon\} \subset C_b(S)$ such that supp $\{\psi_k^\epsilon\} \subset B(\phi_k, \epsilon), 0 \leq \psi_k^\epsilon \leq 1, |\psi_k^\epsilon(x) - \psi_k^\epsilon(y)| \leq \frac{4}{\epsilon} d(x,y)$, and for all $x \in S$, $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \psi_k^\epsilon(x) = 1$ where only finitely many terms in the sum are non zero. In fact, the ψ_k^ϵ can be chosen such that for each compact $K \subset S$, there exists $N_K < \infty$ for which $\sum_{k=1}^{N_K} \psi_k^\epsilon(x) = 1, x \in K$.*

Now let $S = \mathbb{H}$, and let $\{\phi_k\}$ be a countable dense subset of $\mathbb{H}$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let $\{\psi_k^\epsilon\}$ be as in Lemma 2.3. For $x \in D_{\mathbb{H}}[0,\infty)$, define

$$x^\epsilon(t) = \sum_k \psi_k^\epsilon(x(t))\phi_k.$$

Note that since x is cadlag, for each $T > 0$, there exists $N_T < \infty$ such that

$$x^\epsilon(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_T} \psi_k^\epsilon(x(t))\phi_k, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Further observe that

$$\|x(t) - x^\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \sum_k \psi_k^\epsilon(x(t))\|x(t) - \phi_k\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \epsilon.$$

Let X be a cadlag, $\mathbb{H}$-valued, $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$-adapted process and similarly define

$$X^\epsilon(t) = \sum_k \psi_k^\epsilon(X(t))\phi_k. \tag{2.3}$$

Then as observed, $\|X - X^\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \epsilon$ and the stochastic integral of $X_-^\epsilon \cdot Y(t)$ is defined naturally as

$$X_-^\epsilon \cdot Y(t) = \sum_k \int_0^t \psi_k^\epsilon(X(s-))dY(\phi_k, s).$$

The following theorem [Theorem 3.11, [24]] proves the existence of the limit of $\{X_-^\epsilon \cdot Y\}$, which we define as the stochastic integral $X_- \cdot Y$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let Y be a standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale, and let X be an $\mathbb{H}$-valued cadlag adapted process. Define X^ϵ as above. Then*

$$X_- \cdot Y \equiv \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} X_-^\epsilon \cdot Y$$

exists in the sense that for each $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} P\left[\sup_{s \leq t} |X_-^\epsilon \cdot Y(s) - X_- \cdot Y(s)| > \eta\right] = 0,$$

for all $\eta > 0$. $X_- \cdot Y$ is a cadlag process.

Example 2.5. Let (U,r) be a complete, separable metric space and μ a sigma finite measure on $(U, \mathcal{B}(U))$. Denote the Lebesgue measure on $[0,\infty)$ by λ, and let W be a space-time Gaussian white noise on $U \times [0,\infty)$ based on $\mu \otimes \lambda$, that is, W is a Gaussian process indexed by $\mathcal{B}(U) \times [0,\infty)$ with $E(W(A,t)) = 0$ and $E(W(A,t)W(B,s)) = \mu(A \cap B)\min\{t,s\}$. For $h \in L^2(\mu)$, define $W(h,t) = \int_{U \times [0,t)} h(x)W(dx,ds)$. The above integration is defined (see [37]), and it follows that W is an $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale with $\mathbb{H} = L^2(\mu)$. It is also easy to check that W is standard in the sense of Definition 2.2.

Example 2.6. Let U, r, μ and λ be as before. Let ξ be a Poisson random measure on $U \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure $\mu \otimes \lambda$, that is for each $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(U) \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, \infty))$, $\xi(\Gamma)$ is a Poisson random variable with mean $\mu \otimes \lambda(\Gamma)$, and for disjoint Γ_1 and Γ_2, $\xi(\Gamma_1)$ and $\xi(\Gamma_1)$ are independent. For $A \in \mathcal{B}(U)$, define $\widetilde{\xi}(A, t) = \xi(A \times [0, t]) - t\mu(A)$. For $h \in L^2(\mu)$, let $\widetilde{\xi}(h, t) = \int_{U\times[0,t)} h(x)\widetilde{\xi}(dx, ds)$ and for $h \in L^1(\mu)$, let $\xi(h, t) = \int_{U\times[0,t)} h(x)\xi(dx, ds)$. Then $\widetilde{\xi}$ is a standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-martingale with $\mathbb{H} = L^2(\mu)$ and ξ is a standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale with $\mathbb{H} = L^1(\mu)$. The above indexing spaces can be changed as long as the corresponding integrations are defined.

Remark 2.7. *In fact, it can be shown that most worthy martingale random measures or more generally semimartingale random measures are standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales for appropriate choice of indexing space $\mathbb{H}$ (see [24]).*

2.3. $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$*-semimartingale and infinite-dimensional stochastic integrals.* In the previous part, observe that the stochastic integrals with respect to infinite-dimensional standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales are real-valued. Function valued stochastic integrals are of interest in many areas of infinite-dimensional stochastic analysis, for example, stochastic partial differential equations. With that in mind, we want to study stochastic integrals taking values in some infinite-dimensional space. If Y is a standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale, we could put $H(x, t) = X(\cdot-, x) \cdot Y(t)$ where for each x in a Polish space E, $X(\cdot, x)$ is a cadlag process with values in $\mathbb{H}$. The above integral is defined, but the function properties of H are not immediately clear. Hence, a careful approach is needed for constructing infinite-dimensional stochastic integrals. In [24], Kurtz and Protter introduced the concept of $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingale as a natural analogue of the $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale for developing infinite-dimensional stochastic integrals. Below, we give a brief outline of that theory.

Let (E, r_E) and (U, r_U) be two complete, separable metric spaces. Let $\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{H}$ be separable Banach spaces of $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions on E and U respectively. Note that for function spaces, the product $fg, f \in \mathbb{L}, g \in \mathbb{H}$ has the natural interpretation of point-wise product. Suppose that $\{f_i\}$ and $\{g_j\}$ are such that the finite linear combinations of the f_i are dense in $\mathbb{L}$, and the finite linear combinations of the g_j are dense in $\mathbb{H}$.

Definition 2.8. *Let $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ be the completion of the linear space $\left\{\sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} f_i g_j : f_i \in \{f_i\}, g_j \in \{g_j\}\right\}$ with respect to some norm $\|\cdot\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}$.*

For example, if

$$\|\sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} f_i g_j\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}} = \sup\left\{\sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij}\langle\lambda, f_i\rangle\langle\eta, g_j\rangle : \lambda \in \mathbb{L}^*, \eta \in \mathbb{H}^*, \|\lambda\|_{\mathbb{L}^*} \le 1, \|\eta\|_{\mathbb{H}^*} \le 1\right\}$$

then $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ can be interpreted as a subspace of the space of bounded operators, $L(\mathbb{K}^*, \mathbb{L})$.

Let $\zeta_k = \sum_{i,j} a_{kij} f_i g_j, k = 1, 2, \dots$ be a dense sequence in $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$, where in each sum only finitely many a_{kij} are nonzero. Then Lemma 2.3 gives the partition functions $\{\psi_k^\epsilon\}$ corresponding to the dense set $\{\zeta_k\}$, and for $x \in \widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ defining

$$x^\epsilon = \sum_k \psi_k^\epsilon(x)\zeta_k$$

as before, we have

$$\|x^\epsilon - x\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}} \le \epsilon.$$

Notice that x^ϵ can be written as

$$x^\epsilon = \sum_{i,j} c^\epsilon_{ij}(x) f_i g_j \tag{2.4}$$

where $c^\epsilon_{ij}(x) = \sum_k \psi^\epsilon_k(x) a_{kij}$.

With the above approximation in mind, denote $\mathcal{S}_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}$ as the space of all processes $X \in D_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}[0,\infty)$ of the form

$$X(t) = \sum_{ij} \xi_{ij}(t) f_i g_j$$

where ξ_{ij} are $\mathbb{R}$-valued, cadlag, adapted processes and only fintely many ξ_{ij} are non zero. If Y is an $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale, and $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}$ is of the above form define

$$X_- \cdot Y(t) = \sum_i f_i \sum_j \int_0^t \xi_{ij}(s-)\, dY(g_j, s).$$

Notice that $X_- \cdot Y \in D_{\mathbb{L}}[0,\infty)$.

Definition 2.9. *An $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale is a* **standard** $(\mathbb{L},\widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$**-semimartingale** *if*

$$\mathcal{H}_t \equiv \left\{ \sup_{s\le t} \|X_- \cdot Y(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}} : X \in \mathcal{S}_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}, \sup_{s\le t} \|X(s)\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}} \le 1 \right\}$$

is stochastically bounded for each $t > 0$.

As in Theorem 2.4, under the standardness assumption, the definition of $X_- \cdot Y$ can be extended to all cadlag $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$-valued processes X by approximating X by X^ϵ, where

$$X^\epsilon(t) = \sum_k \psi^\epsilon_k(X(t))\zeta_k = \sum_{i,j} c^\epsilon_{ij}(X(t)) f_i g_j.$$

Remark 2.10. *The standardness condition in Definition 2.9 will follow if there exists a constant $C(t)$ such that*

$$E\left[\|X_- \cdot Y(t)\|_{\mathbb{L}}\right] \le C(t)$$

for all $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}$ satisfying $\sup_{s\le t} \|X(s)\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}} \le 1$.

Remark 2.11. *If $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{L}$ are general Banach spaces (rather than Banach spaces of functions), then $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ could be taken as the completion of $\mathbb{L} \otimes \mathbb{H}$ with respect to some norm, for example the projective norm (see [30]).*

3. Uniform Exponential Tightness.

We wish to extend the result of Garcia [18] to stochastic integrals driven by a sequence of $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales or $(\mathbb{L},\widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingales. With this in mind, we first extend the notion of uniform exponential tightness (UET) to $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales and $(\mathbb{L},\widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingales. Our goal is to prove that a large deviation principle holds for the sequence of stochastic integrals $\{X_{n-} \cdot Y_n\}$, when $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle and the the driving integrators Y_n form a UET sequence of $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales or $(\mathbb{L},\widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingales. Since, in general it is not clear in which space the Y_n take values, the large deviation principle of $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ has to be defined carefully (see the next section).

Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$ be a sequence of right continuous filtrations. Let $\mathcal{S}_t^n$ denote the space of all $\mathbb{H}$-valued processes Z, such that $\sup_{s\leq t}\|Z(s)\| \leq 1$ and is of the form

$$Z(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \xi_k(t) h_k,$$

where the ξ_k are cadlag and $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$-adapted $\mathbb{R}$ valued processes and $h_1, \ldots, h_n \in \mathbb{H}$.

Definition 3.1. *A sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$-adapted, standard $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingales $\{Y_n\}$ is* **uniformly exponentially tight** *if, for every $a > 0$ and $t > 0$, there exists a $k(t,a)$ such that*

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sup_{Z\in\mathcal{S}^n} \log P\left[\sup_{s\leq t} |Z_- \cdot Y_n(s)| > k(t,a)\right] \leq -a. \tag{3.1}$$

Example 3.2. Let U, r, μ and λ be as in Example 2.5. Let W denote space-time Gaussian white noise on $U \times [0,\infty)$ with $\langle W(A,\cdot), W(B,\cdot)\rangle_t = \mu(A\cap B)t$. Consider W as an $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingale, with $\mathbb{H} = L^2(\mu)$, by defining

$$W(h,t) = \int_{U\times[0,t)} h(x) W(dx, ds), \quad h \in L^2(\mu)$$

We will show that $\left\{W_n \equiv n^{-1/2} W\right\}$ satisfies the UET condition. Let Z be an adapted cadlag $L^2(\mu)$-valued process. Observe that $Z_- \cdot W$ is a continuous martingale with quadratic variation given by

$$[Z_- \cdot W]_t = \int_0^t \|Z(\cdot, s)\|_2^2 \, ds.$$

Therefore we can write $Z_- \cdot W$ as a time changed Brownian motion, where the time change is given by the quadratic variation $[Z_- \cdot W]_t$. More specifically,

$$Z_- \cdot W(t) = B_{[Z_- \cdot W]_t},$$

where B is a standard Brownian Motion. Now for $\sup_{s\leq t}\|Z(\cdot,s)\|_2 \leq 1$, we have that $[Z_- \cdot W]_t \leq t$. Thus, for $a > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\sup_{s\leq t} |Z_-.W_n(s)| > K) &= P(\sup_{s\leq t} |Z_-.W(s)| > \sqrt{n}K) = P(\sup_{s\leq t} |B_{[Z_-\cdot W]_s}| > \sqrt{n}K) \\ &\leq P(\sup_{s\leq t} |B_s| > \sqrt{n}K) \quad (\text{as } [Z_- \cdot W]_t \leq t) \\ &\leq 4\exp(-nK^2/2t). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $k(t,a) \equiv K = (2at)^{1/2}$, it follows that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sup_{Z\in\mathcal{S}^n} \log P\left[\sup_{s\leq t} |Z_- \cdot W_n(s)| > k(t,a)\right] \leq -a$$

and the UET condition is verified.

For the next example we take the indexing Banach space to be an appropriate *Orlicz space*: (see Section A.2)

Example 3.3. Let ξ_n be a Poisson random measure on $U\times[0,\infty)$ with mean measure $d\nu\times ndt$. Then we show $\{X_n\equiv\xi_n/n\}$ satisfies the UET condition when considered as a process indexed by the Banach space $\mathbb{H}=L^\Phi(\nu)$. Here $L^\Phi(\nu)$ is the *Orlicz space* for the function $\Phi(x)=e^x-1$.
Let Z be a $L^\Phi(\nu)$-valued cadlag process such that $\sup_{s\le t}\|Z(\cdot,s)\|_\Phi\le 1$. Since

$$|Z_-\cdot\xi_n|\le|Z_-|\cdot\xi_n,$$

without loss of generality we can take $Z\ge 0$ for our purpose.
We first estimate $E(e^{Z_-\cdot\xi_n})$ by Ito's formula. Let $X_n(t)\equiv Z_-\cdot\xi_n(t)$. For a C^2 function f, Itô's formula implies

$$f(X_n(t))=f(X_n(0))+\int_{U\times[0,t]}f(X_n(s-)+Z(u,s-))-f(X_n(s-))\;\xi_n(du,ds).$$

Taking $f(x)=e^x$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}E(e^{X_n(t)})&=1+nE\int_{U\times[0,t)}e^{X_n(s)}(e^{Z(u,s)}-1)\nu(du)\;ds\\&=1+nE\int_0^t e^{X_n(s)}\int_U(e^{Z(u,s)}-1)\nu(du)\;ds.\end{aligned}$$

Now since $\|f\|_\Phi\le 1$ iff $\int\Phi(|f|)\;d\nu\le 1$, we see from our assumption on the process Z that $\sup_{s\le t}\int_U(e^{Z(u,s)}-1)d\nu(u)\le 1$. Thus,

$$E(e^{X_n(t)})\le 1+nE\int_0^t e^{X_n(s)}\;ds,$$

and by Gronwall's inequality

$$E(e^{X_n(t)})=E(e^{Z_-\cdot Y_n(t)})\le e^{nt}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}P(\sup_{s\le t}n^{-1}Z_-\cdot\xi_n(s)>K)&=P(Z_-\cdot\xi_n(t)>nK)=P(e^{Z_-\cdot\xi_n(t)}>e^{nK})\\&\le E(e^{Z_-\cdot\xi_n(t)})/e^{nK}\le e^{nt-nK}.\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $k(t,a)\equiv K=t+a$, we have

$$\limsup_n\frac{1}{n}\sup_{Z\in\mathcal{S}^n}\log P\left[\sup_{s\le t}n^{-1}|Z_-\cdot\xi_n(s)|>k(t,a)\right]\le -a.$$

The definition of uniform exponential tightness for a sequence of $(\mathbb{L},\widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingale is analogous to that of $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale with the obvious change.
Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$ be a sequence of right continuous filtrations. Recall that the Banach space $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ was defined in Definition 2.8. Let $\mathcal{S}^n$ denote the collection of all $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$-valued processes Z, such that $\|Z(t)\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}\le 1$ and is of the form

$$Z(t)=\sum_{i,j=1}^{l,m}\xi_{i,j}(t)f_ig_j,$$

where the $\xi_{i,j}$ are cadlag and $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$ adapted $\mathbb{R}$ valued processes, $\{f_i\}\subset\mathbb{L},\{g_j\}\subset\mathbb{H}$.

Definition 3.4. *A sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted $(\mathbb{L},\widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingales $\{Y_n\}$ is* **uniformly exponentially tight** *(UET) if, for every $a>0$ and $t>0$, there exists a $k(t,a)$ such that*

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\sup_{Z\in\mathcal{S}^n}\log P\left[\sup_{s\le t}\|Z_-\cdot Y_n(s)\|_{\mathbb{L}}>k(t,a)\right]\le -a. \tag{3.2}$$

4. Large deviations and exponential tightness. We define the exponential tightness and the large deviation principle for a sequence of $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales $\{Y_n\}$. Let $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{K}$ be two Banach spaces.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of cadlag, $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted $\mathbb{K}$-valued processes. $\{(X_n,Y_n)\}$ is said to be* **exponentially tight** *if for every finite collection of elements $\phi_1,\phi_2,\dots\phi_k\in\mathbb{H}$, $\{(X_n,Y_n(\phi_1,\cdot),Y_n(\phi_2,\cdot),\dots,Y_n(\phi_k,\cdot))\}$ is exponentially tight in $D_{\mathbb{K}\times\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)$.*

Definition 4.2. *Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of cadlag, $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted $\mathbb{K}$-valued processes. Let A denote the index set consisting of all ordered finite subsets of $\mathbb{H}$. $\{(X_n,Y_n)\}$ is said to satisfy the* **large deviation principle** *with the rate function family $\{I_\alpha:\alpha\in A\}$ if for $\alpha=(\phi_1,\dots,\phi_k)$, $\{(X_n,Y_n(\phi_1,\cdot),\dots,Y_n(\phi_k,\cdot))\}$ satisfies a LDP in $D_{\mathbb{K}\times\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)$ with the rate function I_α.*

The following lemma shows the canonical consistencies that we expect among the family $\{I_\alpha:\alpha\in A\}$.

Lemma 4.3. *If a sequence of $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales $\{Y_n\}$ satisfies a LDP with the rate function family $\{I_\alpha:\alpha\in A\}$, then we have the following:*

(i) *If $\alpha=(\phi_1,\phi_2,\dots,\phi_k)$ and $\beta=(\phi_{i_1},\phi_{i_2},\dots,\phi_{i_k})$ is a permutation of α, then*

$$I_\alpha(x,y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k)=I_\beta(x,y_{i_1},y_{i_2},\dots,y_{i_k}),\quad (x,y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k)\in D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty).$$

(ii) *If $\alpha=(\phi_1,\phi_2,\dots,\phi_k)$ and $\beta=(\phi_1,\phi_2,\dots,\phi_k,\phi_{k+1})$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}I_\alpha(x,y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k)=\inf_{y_{k+1}}\{I_\beta(x,y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k,y_{k+1}):(x,y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k,y_{k+1})\\ \in D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^{k+1}}[0,\infty)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Notice that the permutation mapping $p:D_{\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)\longrightarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)$, and the projection mapping $\pi:D_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}}[0,\infty)\longrightarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)$ defined respectively by

$$p(y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k)=(y_{i_1},y_{i_2},\dots,y_{i_k}),\quad \pi(y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k,y_{k+1})=(y_1,y_2,\dots,y_k),$$

are continuous, and the theorem follows from the contraction principle. □

Example 4.4. Let W be the space-time Gaussian white noise on $(U\times[0,\infty),\mu\otimes\lambda)$ as in Example 3.2. We saw earlier that W forms a standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale with $\mathbb{H}=L^2(\mu)$. We show below that $\{W_n\equiv n^{-1/2}W\}$ satisfies the LDP in the sense of Definition 4.2.
First note that W is a Gaussian process with stationary and independent increments, and with covariance function

$$E(W(h_1,t)W(h_2,s))=\langle h_1,h_2\rangle(t\wedge s).$$

Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product in $L^2(\mu)$.
For a finite collection $\{h_1, \dots, h_m\}$, $(W(h_1, \cdot), W(h_2, \cdot), \dots, W(h_m, \cdot))$ is a Gaussian process with stationary and independent increments with variance covariance matrix $t\Sigma_h$, where

$$\Sigma_h = [\langle h_i, h_j \rangle]_{i,j=1}^m, \quad h = (h_1, \dots, h_m).$$

Since Σ_h is symmetric and non-negative definite,

$$\Sigma_h = C_h C_h^T.$$

It follows that

$$(W(h_1, \cdot), W(h_2, \cdot), \dots, W(h_m, \cdot)) = C_h B(\cdot),$$

where B is a standard m- dimensional Brownian Motion. Now an application of the contraction principle and Schilder's theorem implies that $\{(W_n(h_1, \cdot), W_n(h_2, \cdot), \dots, W_n(h_m, \cdot))\}$ follows LDP with rate function $I_h(\psi)$, where

$$I_h(\psi) = \inf \left\{ 1/2 \int_0^\infty \|\dot{\phi}(t)\|^2 \, dt : \psi(\cdot) = C_h \phi(\cdot), \ \phi(t) = \int_0^t \dot{\phi}(u) \, du \text{ for some } \dot{\phi} \in L^2 \right\}.$$

Example 4.5. Let ξ be a Poisson random measure on $U \times [0, \infty)$ with mean measure $d\nu \times dt$. Define $Z_n(A, t) = \xi(A, nt)/n$. Then $\{Z_n\}$ satisfies LDP in the above sense, when the indexing Banach space $\mathbb{H}$ is taken to be Morse-Transue space $M^\Phi(\nu) \subset L^\Phi(\nu)$ (see (A.1) in the Appendix), for $\Phi(x) = e^x - 1$. Note that for any finite collection $\{h_1, \dots, h_m\}$, $(\xi(h_1, \cdot), \xi(h_2, \cdot), \dots, \xi(h_m, \cdot))$ is a cadlag process with stationary and independent increments, hence an m-dimensional Levy process. Now Theorem 1.2 from de Acosta [5] will give a large deviation principle for $\{(Z_n(h_1, \cdot), Z_n(h_2, \cdot), \dots, Z_n(h_m, \cdot))\}$, provided we verify the hypothesis

$$E(\exp(\beta \sum_{i=1}^m |\xi(h_i, 1)|)) < \infty \quad \text{for every } \beta > 0.$$

It is enough to show that

$$E(\exp(\beta \sum_{i=1}^m \xi(|h_i|, 1))) < \infty.$$

Note that from Itô's lemma, if $X(t) = \int_{U \times [0,t)} Z(u, s) \xi(du \times ds)$, then

$$E\left[\exp(X(t))\right] = 1 + E \int_{U \times [0,t)} e^{X(s)} (e^{Z(u,s)} - 1) \, \nu(du) \, ds \tag{4.1}$$

Choosing $Z(u, t) \equiv \beta \sum_{i=1}^m |h_i|(u)$, we get

$$E\left[\exp(\beta \sum_{i=1}^m \xi(|h_i|, 1))\right] = \exp(\int_U (e^{\beta \sum |h_i|(u)} - 1) \, \nu(du)) < \infty.$$

The last inequality holds as $h_1, \dots h_m \in M^\Phi(\nu)$ implies that $\beta \sum_{i=1}^m h_i \in M^\Phi(\nu)$.
The associated rate function is given by

$$I(\phi) = \begin{cases} \int_0^\infty \lambda(\dot{\phi}(s)) \, ds, & \text{if } \phi(t) = \int_0^t \dot{\phi}(u) \, du \text{ for some } \dot{\phi} \in L^1. \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

where λ is the Fenchel-Legendre transformation of

$$\mu(x) = \log E(\exp(\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \xi(h_i, 1))), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_m),$$

that is,

$$\lambda(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left[x \cdot y - \mu(x) \right].$$

Putting $Z(u,t) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i h_i(u)$ in (4.1),

$$E\left[\exp(\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \xi(h_i, 1))\right] = \exp(\int_U e^{\sum x_i h_i(u)} - 1 \ \nu(du)).$$

It follows that

$$\mu(x) = \int_U (e^{\sum x_i h_i(u)} - 1) \ \nu(du).$$

4.1. *LDP results for stochastic integrals: $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingales.* Recall that for a process X, X^{ϵ} is defined by (2.3).

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$-adapted, standard $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\mathbb{H}$-valued processes. Assume that $\{Y_n\}$ is UET. If $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ is exponentially tight in the sense of Definition 4.1, then $\left\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-}^{\epsilon} \cdot Y_n)\right\}$ is exponentially tight.*

Proof. Let $\beta = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$ be an ordered subset of $\mathbb{H}$. Denote

$$Y_n(\beta, \cdot) = (Y_n(h_1, \cdot) \dots, Y_n(h_m, \cdot)).$$

We have to prove that $\left\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta, \cdot), X_{n-}^{\epsilon} \cdot Y_n)\right\}$ is exponentially tight in $D_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}}$.

Since $\{X_n\}$ is exponentially tight, it satisfies the exponential compact containment condition. Thus, for every $a > 0$, there exists a compact set K_a such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[X_n(t) \notin K_a, \text{ for some } t < a\right] \leq -a.$$

Let $\tau_{n,a} = \inf\{s : X_n(s) \notin K_a\}$. Then notice that

$$P\left[\tau_{n,a} < a\right] = P\left[X_n(t) \notin K_a, \text{ for some } t < a\right].$$

Hence

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[\tau_{n,a} < a\right] \leq -a. \tag{4.3}$$

For a stopping time τ, define

$$X^{\tau-} = X_t 1_{[t<\tau]} + X_{\tau-} 1_{[t \geq \tau]}.$$

Notice that for each $t > 0$, $X_n^{\tau_{n,a}-}(t) \in K_a$. Hence, there exists N_a such that

$$X_n^{\epsilon, \tau_{n,a}-}(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_a} \psi_k^{\epsilon}(X_n^{\tau_{n,a}-}(s)) \phi_k.$$

Here $\{\psi_k^\epsilon\}$ is the partition of unity as in Lemma 2.3. Clearly, by the construction,

$$\|X_n^{\epsilon,\tau_{n,a}-}(s) - X_n^{\tau_{n,a}-}(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \epsilon.$$

Notice that for $t < \tau_{n,a}$

$$\begin{aligned} X_n^{\epsilon,\tau_{n,a}-} \cdot Y_n(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_a} \int_0^t \psi_k^\epsilon(X_n^{\tau_{n,a}-}(s))\ dY_n(\phi_k, s) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_a} \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_{n,a}-} \psi_k^\epsilon(X_n(s))\ dY_n(\phi_k, s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus putting

$$Z_n^{a,\epsilon} = \sum_{k=1}^{N_a} \int_0^t \psi_k^\epsilon(X_n(s))\ dY_n(\phi_k, s), \tag{4.4}$$

we have

$$Z_n^{a,\epsilon}(t) = X_n^\epsilon \cdot Y_n(t) \quad \text{for } t < \tau_{n,a}. \tag{4.5}$$

Since $\{Y_n\}$ is uniformly exponentially tight and $\{\psi_k^\epsilon(X_n(\cdot))\}$ is exponentially tight, we deduce from Lemma 7.4 of Garcia [18] that $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z_n^{a,\epsilon})\}$ is exponentially tight.
Taking $\lambda(t) = t$ in the definition of metric d in Ethier and Kurtz [12] (Page 117), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(X_{n-}^\epsilon \cdot Y_n, Z_n^{a,\epsilon}) &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-u} \sup_{t\geq 0} |Z_n^{a,\epsilon}(t\wedge u) - X_{n-}^\epsilon \cdot Y_n(t\wedge u)| \wedge 1\ du \\ &\leq \int_0^{\tau_{n,a}-} (\dots) + \int_{\tau_{n,a}}^\infty (\dots) \\ &\leq e^{-\tau_{n,a}}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

as the first integral is 0 in the second line by (4.5). The same technique in fact gives us

$$d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}^\epsilon \cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z_n^{a,\epsilon})) \leq e^{-\tau_{n,a}}. \tag{4.7}$$

Choose $a > -\log\delta > 0$ and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}^\epsilon \cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z_n^{a,\epsilon})) > \delta\right] \\ &\qquad \leq \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P(\tau_{n,a} < -\log\delta) \leq -a. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Since $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z_n^{a,\epsilon})\}$ is exponentially tight, there exists a compact set F_a such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z_n^{a,\epsilon}) \notin F_a\right] \leq -a.$$

Now as

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z_n^{a,\epsilon}) \in F_a\} \cap \left\{d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}^\epsilon \cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z_n^{a,\epsilon})) < \delta\right\} \\ &\qquad \subset \left\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}^\epsilon \cdot Y_n) \in F_a^\delta\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n) \notin F^{\delta}_a\right] &\leq \limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z^{a,\epsilon}_n) \notin F_a\right] \\ &\quad \vee \log P\left[d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z^{a,\epsilon}_n)) > \delta\right] \\ &\leq -a.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.3 of Feng and Kurtz [13], we get $\left\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\right\}$ is exponentially tight. □

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted, standard $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\mathbb{H}$-valued processes. Assume that $\{Y_n\}$ is UET. If $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ is exponentially tight in the sense of Definition 4.1, then $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\}$ is exponentially tight.*

Proof. Let $\beta = (h_1, \ldots, h_m)$ be an ordered subset of $\mathbb{H}$. Define

$$Y_n(\beta,\cdot) = (Y_n(h_1,\cdot), \ldots, Y_n(h_m,\cdot)).$$

We have to prove that $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\}$ is exponentially tight in $D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^m\times\mathbb{R}}$.
Since $\left\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\right\}$ is exponentially tight, for every $a > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_{a,\epsilon}$ such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n) \notin K_{a,\epsilon}\right] \leq -a.$$

Since $\{Y_n\}$ is UET, for every $a > 0$, there exists $k(t,a)$ such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[\sup_{s\leq t}|Z_n\cdot Y_n(s)| > k(t,a)\right] \leq -a,$$

for any sequence of cadlag $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted $\{Z_n\}$ satisfying $\sup_{s\leq t}\|Z_n(s)\| \leq 1$. Without loss of generality, assume that $k(t,a)$ is nondecreasing right continuous function of t.
Now recall that $\|X^{\epsilon}_n(s) - X_n(s)\| \leq \epsilon$. Therefore

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[\sup_{s\leq t}|(X_n - X^{\epsilon}_n)\cdot Y_n(s)| > \epsilon\; k(t,a)\right] \leq -a.$$

Notice that for any $t > 0$, using $\lambda(s) = s$ in the definition of metric d (see Ethier and Kurtz [12], Page 117), we have

$$d(X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n, X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) \leq \sup_{s\leq t}|(X_n - X^{\epsilon}_n)\cdot Y_n(s)| + e^{-t} \tag{4.9}$$

$$d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)) \leq \sup_{s\leq t}|(X_n - X^{\epsilon}_n)\cdot Y_n(s)| + e^{-t}. \tag{4.10}$$

Let $\delta > 0$. Notice that if we take $t > 0$, such that $e^{-t} < \delta/2$, then

(4.11)
$$\left\{d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)) > \delta\right\} \subset \left\{\sup_{s\leq t}|(X_n - X^{\epsilon}_n)\cdot Y_n(s)| > \delta/2\right\}.$$

Choose $t > 0$ such that $e^{-t} < \delta/2$. Then taking $\epsilon \equiv \epsilon_a$ such that $\epsilon_a\ k(t,a) \le \delta/2$ and denoting K_{a,ϵ_a} by K^a for convenience, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P[(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) \notin K^{a,\delta}] \le \limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P[(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n) \\ \notin K^{a,\delta}] \vee \log P[d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n), \\ (X_n, Y_n, X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)) > \delta] \quad \le -a.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\}$ is exponentially tight. □

We next prove the main theorem of this section.

THEOREM 4.8. *Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted, standard $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\mathbb{H}$-valued processes. Assume that $\{Y_n\}$ is UET. If $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a LDP in the sense of Definition 4.2, with the rate function family $\{I_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$, then $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\}$ also satisfies a LDP.*

PROOF. The proof uses the same technique as in the proof of Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 4.7. The same notation is used here as well. Let $\beta = (h_1\dots, h_m)$ be a finite ordered subset of $\mathbb{H}$. We have to prove that $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\}$ satisfies a LDP with some rate function $J_\beta(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$. Let $\delta > 0$, and choose $a > -\log\delta$. Define $Z^{a,\epsilon}_n$ by (4.4) and $\tau_{n,a}$ as in Lemma 4.6. Then from (4.8) ,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot)X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z^{a,\epsilon}_n)) > \delta\right] \\ \le \limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P(\tau_{n,a} < -\log\delta) \\ \le -a. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Choose $t > 0$ so that $e^{-t} < \delta/2$, and then take $\epsilon \equiv \epsilon_a$ such that $\epsilon_a\ k(t,a) \le \delta/2$. Using (4.11) and the fact $\{Y_n\}$ is UET, we have

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X^{\epsilon_a}_{n-}\cdot Y_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)) > \delta\right] \le -a. \tag{4.13}$$

Combining (4.12) and (4.13), it follows that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[d((X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z^{a,\epsilon_a}_n), (X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)) > \delta\right] \le -a.$$

Now it follows from the finite dimensional result of Garcia [18] (see Theorem 1.4 in the Introduction) that $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z^{a,\epsilon_a}_n)\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle. Since $\delta \to 0$ and $a \to \infty$ implies that $\epsilon \to 0$, Lemma 3.14 of Feng and Kurtz proves that $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n)\}$ satisfies a LDP with the rate function

$$J_\beta(x, y^\beta, z) = \sup_{\eta>0}\liminf_{\epsilon\to 0}\liminf_{a\to\infty} J^{a,\epsilon}_\beta(B((x, y^\beta, z), \eta)). \tag{4.14}$$

where $J^{a,\epsilon}_\beta$ is the rate function for $\{(X_n, Y_n(\beta,\cdot), Z^{a,\epsilon}_n)\}$, and is given by

$$\begin{aligned}J^{a,\epsilon}_\beta(x, y^\beta, z) = \inf_{y^a}\{I_{(\alpha_a,\beta)}(x,(y^a, y^\beta)) : z = \sum_{k=1}^{N_a}\psi^\epsilon_k(x)\cdot y^a_k, \\ (x, y^a, y^\beta) \in D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^{N_a+m}}[0,\infty),\ (y^a, y^\beta) \text{ finite variation}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

□

4.2. *Identification of the rate function.* Since $\mathbb{H}$ is a separable Banach space it has a pseudo-basis $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$, where $\phi_k \in \mathbb{H}, p_k \in C(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R})$ (see Section A.3), that is, for every $h \in \mathbb{H}$, we have

$$h = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k(h)\phi_k. \tag{4.16}$$

If $\mathbb{H}$ is a separable Hilbert space then we take $\{\phi_k\}$ to be an orthonormal basis and

$$p_k(\cdot) = \langle \cdot, \phi_k \rangle \in \mathbb{H}^* = \mathbb{H}.$$

For a general separable Banach space $\mathbb{H}$, we will assume throughout that the pseudo-basis $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ satisfies (ii) of Theorem A.13.

The following **notation** will be used in the subsequent discussions.

- $\alpha_k = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_k)$.
- $\alpha = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots)$.
- $P_N(h) = (p_1(h), \ldots, p_N(h))$.
- $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots) \in D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0, \infty)$.
- $y^{(k)} = (y_1, \ldots, y_k) \in D_{\mathbb{R}^k}[0, \infty)$.
- If Y_n is an $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale then $Y_n(\alpha_k, \cdot) = (Y_n(\phi_1, \cdot), \ldots, Y_n(\phi_k, \cdot))$ and $Y_n(\alpha, \cdot) = (Y_n(\phi_1, \cdot), Y_n(\phi_2, \cdot), \ldots)$.
- I_{α_k} and I_α will denote the rate function of $\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha_k, \cdot))\}$ and $\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot))\}$ respectively. Similarly, J_{α_k} and J_α will denote the rate function of $\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha_k, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ and $\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ respectively.

For $\mathbf{y}^* \in D_{\mathbb{H}^*}[0, \infty)$, define the total variation of $\mathbf{y}^*$ in the interval $[0, t)$ as

$$T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) = \sup_\sigma \sum_i \|\mathbf{y}^*(t_i) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i-1})\|_{\mathbb{H}^*},$$

If $\mathbf{y}^* \in D_{\mathbb{H}^*}[0, \infty)$ is such that $T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) < \infty$, then the integral $x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$ can be defined as

$$x \cdot \mathbf{y}^* = \lim_{\|\sigma\| \to 0} \sum_i \langle x(t_i), \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i+1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_i) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}^*},$$

where $\sigma = \{t_i\}$ is a partition of $[0, t]$, and $\|\sigma\|$ denotes the mesh of the partition σ (see A.5 in the Appendix).

We give a review of the results obtained so far in this context.

Since $X_n \in D_{\mathbb{H}}[0, \infty)$, we have

$$X_n(t) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_k(X_n(t))\phi_k.$$

Let

$$X_n^{(m)}(t) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{m} p_k(X_n(t))\phi_k.$$

Suppose $J_{\alpha_k}^m$ and J_α^m denote the rate functions for $(X_n, Y_n(\alpha_k, \cdot), X_{n-}^{(m)} \cdot Y_n)$ and $(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot), X_{n-}^{(m)} \cdot Y_n)$ respectively. Then for $k \geq m$,

$$J_{\alpha_k}^m(x, y^{(k)}, z) = I_{\alpha_k}(x, y^{(k)}) \;\text{ if } z(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} p_j(x) \cdot y_j(t), \quad y^{(k)} \text{ finite variation.} \tag{4.17}$$

$$= \infty \;\text{ otherwise.} \tag{4.18}$$

By the Dawson-Gartner theorem [7],

$$J^m_\alpha(x,y,z) = \sup_k J^m_{\alpha_k}(x, y^{(k)}, z). \tag{4.19}$$

Finally, we have

$$J_\alpha(x,y,z) = \sup_{\eta>0} \liminf_{m\to\infty} J^m_\alpha(B_\eta((x,y,z))),$$

where $B_\eta((x,y,z))$ is the ball of radius η in $D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty\times\mathbb{R}}$.

The UET property of the sequence $\{Y_n\}$ has several interesting consequences. First of all, we show that if $I_\alpha(x,y)<\infty$, then $\mathbf{y}^*(t) \equiv \sum_j y_j(t)p_j$ exists as an element of $\mathbb{H}^*$, where $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ is a pseudo-basis of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying ((ii)) of Theorem A.13. When $\mathbb{H}$ is a Hilbert space then notice that the $p_j \in \mathbb{H}^* = \mathbb{H}$ are orthogonal and the fact that $\sum_j y_j(t)p_j \in \mathbb{H}$ can be proved by simply showing that $\sum_j |y_j(t)|^2 < \infty$. For a general Banach space $\mathbb{H}$, the proof goes by first showing the convergence of $\sum_j y_j(t)p_j$ in $C(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{R})$ topologized by the family of seminorm $\{\sigma_C : C \subset \mathbb{H} \text{ compact}\}$, where the σ_C are defined by

$$\sigma_C(f) = \sup_{h\in C} |f(h)|.$$

The second step is to show that for every $t>0$, the mapping

$$h \in \mathbb{H} \longrightarrow \sum_j y_j(t)p_j(h)$$

is linear. Next, we show that $\mathbf{y}^*$ has finite total variation over any finite interval.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space. Choose a pseudo-basis $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying (ii) of Theorem A.13. Suppose that $\{Y_n\}$ is a UET sequence. Suppose that for $(x,y) \in D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$, $I_\alpha(x,y)<\infty$. Then,*

(i) *for every compact set $C \subset \mathbb{H}$,*

$$\sup_{t\le T}\sup_{h\in C} \Big|\sum_{j=M}^N y_j(t)p_j(h)\Big| \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad M,N\to\infty.$$

(ii) *for every $t>0$, $\mathbf{y}^*(t) \in \mathbb{H}^*$, where $\mathbf{y}^*(t) \equiv \sum_j y_j(t)p_j$*

(iii) *for every $t>0$, $T_t(\mathbf{y}^*)<\infty$.*

Remark 4.10. *Notice that by (i) of Theorem 4.9, if $I_\alpha(x,y)<\infty$, then for each $t>0$, $\mathbf{y}^*(t) \in C(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{R})$, where*

$$\mathbf{y}^*(t) = \sum_k y_k(t)p_k. \tag{4.20}$$

In fact, from the conclusion of the lemma it follows that $\mathbf{y}^*$ is a cadlag function in the time variable, that is $\mathbf{y}^* \in D_{C(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{R})}[0,\infty)$. Part (ii) of Theorem 4.9 tells that if $I_\alpha(x,y)<\infty$, then $\mathbf{y}^* \in D_{\mathbb{H}^*}[0,\infty)$.

For convenience of the reader, we first prove the theorem for a separable Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ with an orthonormal basis $\{\phi_k\}$. Since $\mathbb{H} \equiv \mathbb{H}^*$, the $p_k(\cdot) = \langle\cdot, \phi_k\rangle$ can be identified with ϕ_k.

Theorem 4.11. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{\phi_k\}$. Suppose that $\{Y_n\}$ is a UET sequence. Suppose that for $(x,y) \in D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$, $I_\alpha(x,y)<\infty$. Then*

(i) $\sup_{t\leq T}\sum_j |y_j(t)|^2 < \infty$, *for all* $T > 0$.
(ii) *for every* $t > 0$, $T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) < \infty$.

Proof. The proofs go by the method of contradiction.

(i) Assuming that the conclusion to be not true, we arrive at a contradiction by showing that $I_\alpha(x, y) = \infty$. If (i) is not true, then for any large K, we can find an N such that

$$\sup_{t\leq T}\sum_{j=1}^{N} |y_j(t)|^2 > (K + 2)^2.$$

Fix an $a > 0$. Take $K \equiv k(T, a)$, where $k(T, a)$ is defined in (3.1).
Find a $0 < t \leq T$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{N} |y_j(t)|^2 > (K + 1)^2$ and without loss of generality, take $t > 0$ such that y is continuous at t.
By the continuity of the projection $\pi_t : D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at y, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $r > 0$ such that

$$d(u, y) < r \quad \Rightarrow \quad |u_i(t) - y_i(t)| < \epsilon, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N.$$

Choose $\epsilon = (N)^{-1}$. Define

$$z(s) = \frac{1}{\|y^{(N)}(t)\|}\sum_{k=1}^{N} y_k(t)1_{[0,t)}(s)\phi_k.$$

Notice that $\sup_{s\leq t}\|z(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq 1$.

Claim: $[d(Y_n(\alpha, \cdot), y) < r] \subset [z \cdot Y_n(t) > K]$
Proof of the claim: Let $\omega \in LHS$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} z \cdot Y_n(\omega, t) &= \frac{1}{\|y^{(N)}(t)\|}\sum_{k=1}^{N} y_k(t)Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) \\ &= \frac{1}{\|y^{(N)}(t)\|}\sum_{k=1}^{N} y_k(t)^2 + \frac{1}{\|y^{(N)}(t)\|}\sum_{k=1}^{N} y_k(t)(Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) - y_k(t)) \\ &= (\sum_{k=1}^{N} y_k(t)^2)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{\|y^{(N)}(t)\|}\sum_{k=1}^{N} y_k(t)(Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) - y_k(t)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |z \cdot Y_n(\omega, t)| &\geq |(\sum_{k=1}^{N} y_k(t)^2)^{1/2}| - \frac{1}{\|y^{(N)}(t)\|}\sum_{k=1}^{N} |y_k(t)||Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) - y_k(t)| \\ &\geq K + 1 - \epsilon N = K. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned} P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot)) \in B_r(x, y)\right] &\leq P\left[d(Y_n(\alpha, \cdot), y) < r\right] \\ &\leq P\left[z \cdot Y_n(t) > K\right] \\ &\leq P\left[\sup_{s\leq T}|z_- \cdot Y_n(s)| > k(T, a)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using uniform exponential tightness (3.1), we find

$$-I_\alpha(x,y) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot)) \in B_\delta(x,y)\right] \leq -a.$$

Since this is true for all a, $I_\alpha(x,y) = \infty$ and we are done.

(ii) If $T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) = \infty$, then for any large K, we can find a partition $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^p$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbf{y}^*(t_i) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i-1})\|_{\mathbb{H}} > (K+2),$$

Since

$$\|\mathbf{y}^*(t_i) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i-1})\|_{\mathbb{H}} = (\sum_k (y_k(t_i) - y_k(t_{i-1}))^2)^{1/2},$$

we can find an $N > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^p (\sum_{k=1}^N (y_k(t_i) - y_k(t_{i-1}))^2)^{1/2} > (K+1).$$

Fix an $a > 0$. Take $K \equiv k(T,a)$, where $k(T,a)$ is defined in (3.1).
Without loss of generality, assume that y is continuous at $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^p$.
By the continuity of the projections $\pi_{t_i} : D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at y, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $r > 0$ such that

$$d(u,y) < r \quad \Rightarrow \quad |u_k(t_i) - y_k(t_i)| < \epsilon, \quad k = 1,\ldots,N, i = 1,\ldots,p.$$

Choose $\epsilon = (2pN)^{-1}$. Define

$$z(s) = \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{1}{\|y^{(N)}(t_i) - y^{(N)}(t_{i-1})\|} \sum_{k=1}^N (y_k(t_i) - y_k(t_{i-1})) 1_{[t_{i-1},t_i)}(s)\phi_k.$$

Notice that $\sup_{s\leq t} \|z(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq 1$.
As in the previous proof, it follows that,

$$\left[d(Y_n(\alpha,\cdot),y) < r\right] \subset \left[z \cdot Y_n(t) > K\right].$$

Thus we get,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot)) \in B_r(x,y)\right] &\leq P\left[d(Y_n(\alpha,\cdot),y) < r\right] \\ &\leq P\left[z \cdot Y_n(t) > K\right] \\ &\leq P\left[\sup_{s\leq T} |z_- \cdot Y_n(s)| > k(T,a)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using uniform exponential tightness (3.1), we find

$$-I_\alpha(x,y) \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot)) \in B_\delta(x,y)\right] \leq -a.$$

Since this is true for all a, we are done.

□

We now proceed to prove Theorem 4.9.

Proof. (Theorem 4.9)

(i) Let $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ be a pseudo-basis of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying ((ii)) of Theorem A.13. Fix an $a > 0$. For $T > 0$, define $k(T, a)$ by (3.1). If the result is not true, then there exist a $\rho < (k(T, a) + 1)^{-1}$ and a compact set C such that for all N_0, there exist $N > M > N_0$ and a $0 < t < T$ such that

$$\sup_{h \in C} \Big| \sum_{j=M}^{N} y_j(t) p_j(h) \Big| > 2\rho.$$

Since $\sup_{h\in C} \| \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_k(h)\phi_k - h\|_{\mathbb{H}} \to 0$, there exists an N_0 such that for all $M, N > N_0$

$$\sup_{h \in C} \Big\| \sum_{k=M}^{N} p_k(h)\phi_k \Big\|_{\mathbb{H}} < \rho^2. \tag{4.21}$$

For this N_0, find $N > M > N_0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \le T} \sup_{h \in C} \Big| \sum_{j=M}^{N} y_j(t) p_j(h) \Big| > 2\rho.$$

Next find a $0 < t < T$ (depending on M, N and T) and a $\gamma_t \in C$ such that

$$\Big| \sum_{j=M}^{N} y_j(t) p_j(\gamma_t) \Big| > \rho. \tag{4.22}$$

Without loss of generality assume that t is a continuity point of $y_i, i = M, \ldots, N$.

By the continuity of the projection $\pi_t : D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at y, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $r > 0$, such that

$$d(u, y) < r \quad \Rightarrow \quad |u_i(t) - y_i(t)| < \epsilon, \quad i = M, \ldots, N.$$

Choose $\epsilon = \rho^2 (\sup_{h\in C} \sum_{M \le k \le N} |p_k(h)|)^{-1}$.

Define

$$z(s) = \rho^{-2} \sum_{k=M}^{N} p_k(\gamma_t) 1_{[0,t)}(s) \phi_k.$$

Observe that by (4.21), $\sup_{s \le t} \|z(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}} \le 1$. We claim that

Claim: $[d(Y_n(\alpha, \cdot), y) < r] \subset [z \cdot Y_n(t) > k(t, a)]$

Proof of the claim: Let $\omega \in LHS$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} z \cdot Y_n(\omega, t) &= \rho^{-2} \sum_{k=M}^{N} p_k(\gamma_t) Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) \\ &= \rho^{-2} \sum_{k=M}^{N} p_k(\gamma_t) y_k(t) + \rho^{-2} p_k(\gamma_t)(Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) - y_k(t)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.22) that

$$\begin{aligned}|z\cdot Y_n(\omega,t)| &\geq \rho^{-1}-\rho^{-2}\epsilon\sum_{M\leq k\leq N}|p_k(\gamma_t)|\\ &\geq k(T,a)+1-\rho^{-2}\epsilon\sup_{h\in C}\sum_{M\leq k\leq N}|p_k(h)|\\ &\geq k(T,a)\qquad(\text{ by the choice of }\epsilon)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}P\left[(X_n,Y_n(\alpha,\cdot))\in B_r(x,y)\right] &\leq P\left[d(Y_n(\alpha,\cdot),y)<r\right]\\ &\leq P\left[z\cdot Y_n(t)>K\right]\\ &\leq P\left[\sup_{s\leq T}|z_-\cdot Y_n(s)|>k(T,a)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using uniform exponential tightness (3.1), we find

$$-I_\alpha(x,y)\leq\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P\left[(X_n,Y_n(\alpha,\cdot))\in B_r(x,y)\right]\leq -a.$$

Since this is true for all a, we are done.

(ii) We have to prove that

1. $\mathbf{y}^*(t)(g+h)=\mathbf{y}^*(t)(g)+\mathbf{y}^*(t)h,\quad g,h\in\mathbb{H}$.
2. $\mathbf{y}^*(t)(ch)=c\mathbf{y}^*(t)(h),\quad c\in\mathbb{R},h\in\mathbb{H}$.

We prove the first claim and the proof of the second will be similar. Note that once we prove that $\mathbf{y}^*(t)$ is a linear functional, the fact that it is a continuous linear functional will follow from the previous part.

If the conclusion is false, then there exist $g,h\in\mathbb{H}$ such that $\mathbf{y}^*(t)(g+h)\neq\mathbf{y}^*(t)(g)+\mathbf{y}^*(t)(h)$. Fix an $a>0$. Then there exists a $\kappa<(k(t,a)+1)^{-1}$

$$|\mathbf{y}^*(t)(g+h)-\mathbf{y}^*(t)(g)-\mathbf{y}^*(t)(h)|>2\kappa>0. \tag{4.23}$$

Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[p_j(g+h)\phi_j-p_j(g)\phi_j-p_j(h)\phi_j\right]\to 0,\quad\text{as}\quad N\to\infty,$$

find an N_0 such that for all $N>N_0$

$$\|\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[p_j(g+h)\phi_j-p_j(g)\phi_j-p_j(h)\phi_j\right]\|_{\mathbb{H}}<\kappa^2.$$

For this N_0 find an $N>N_0$ such that

$$|\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left[y_j(t)p_j(g+h)-y_j(t)p_j(g)-y_j(t)p_j(h)\right]|>\kappa. \tag{4.24}$$

Without loss of generality assume that t is a continuity point of $(y_1, \dots, y_N)$. By the continuity of the projection $\pi_t : D_{\mathbb{R}^N}[0,\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at y, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $r > 0$ such that

$$d(u, y) < r \quad \Rightarrow \quad |u_i(t) - y_i(t)| < \epsilon, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Choose $\epsilon = \kappa^2 (\sum_{1\le k\le N} |p_k(g+h) - p_k(g) - p_k(h)|)^{-1}$.

Define

$$z(s) = \kappa^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} [p_k(g+h) - p_k(g) - p_k(h)]\, 1_{[0,t)}(s)\phi_k.$$

Observe that $\sup_{s\le t} \|z(s)\|_{\mathbb{H}} \le 1$. We claim that

Claim: $[d(Y_n(\alpha,\cdot), y) < r] \subset [z \cdot Y_n(t) > k(t,a)]$

Proof of the claim: Let $\omega \in LHS$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} z \cdot Y_n(\omega, t) &= \kappa^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} [p_k(g+h) - p_k(g) - p_k(h)]\, Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) \\ &= \kappa^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} [p_k(g+h) - p_k(g) - p_k(h)]\, y_k(t) \\ &\quad + \kappa^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} [p_k(g+h) - p_k(g) - p_k(h)]\, (Y_n(\phi_k, t)(\omega) - y_k(t)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.24) that

$$\begin{aligned} |z \cdot Y_n(\omega, t)| &\ge \kappa^{-1} - \kappa^{-2}\epsilon \sum_{1\le k\le N} |p_k(g+h) - p_k(g) - p_k(h)| \\ &\ge k(t,a) + 1 - \kappa^{-2}\epsilon \sum_{1\le k\le N} |p_k(g+h) - p_k(g) - p_k(h)| \\ &\ge k(t,a) \quad (\text{ by the choice of } \epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is same as the proof of Theorem 4.11.

(iii) Fix an $a > 0$. If the assertion is not true, then we can find a partition $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^p$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} \|\mathbf{y}^*(t_i) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i-1})\|_{\mathbb{H}^*} > (1+\kappa)(K+3),$$

where $\kappa > 0$ and $K = k(t,a)$ is as defined in (3.1) . Then for each $i = 1, \dots p$, find $\gamma_{i-1} \in \mathbb{H}$ with $\|\gamma_{i-1}\|_{\mathbb{H}} \le 1$, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} \|\mathbf{y}^*(t_i)(\gamma_{i-1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i-1})(\gamma_{i-1})\|_{\mathbb{H}^*} > (1+\kappa)(K+2).$$

From the definition $\mathbf{y}^*$ there exists an $N > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} |\sum_{j=1}^{N} (y_j(t_i) - y_j(t_{i-1}))p_j(\gamma_{i-1})| > (1+\kappa)(K+1).$$

Since $\sum_j p_j(\gamma_{i-1})\phi_j = \gamma_{i-1}$, choose N large enough so that

$$\|\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})\phi_j\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq (1+\kappa)\|\gamma_{i-1}\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq (1+\kappa), \quad i=1,\ldots,p. \tag{4.25}$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $y=(y_1,y_2,\ldots)$ is continuous at $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^{p}$. By the continuity of the projections $\pi_{t_i} : D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ at y, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $r > 0$, such that

$$d(u,y) < r \quad \Rightarrow \quad |u_k(t_i) - y_k(t_i)| < \epsilon, \quad k=1,\ldots,N, i=1,\ldots,p.$$

Choose $\epsilon = (1+\kappa)(2p\sum_{k\leq N}\|p_k\|)^{-1}$. Define

$$z(s) = (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\rho_{i-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})1_{[t_{i-1},t_i)}(s)\phi_j,$$

where $\rho_{i-1} = \text{sgn}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})(y_j(t_i) - y_j(t_{i-1}))\right]$.
Notice that (4.25) implies $\|z(s)\| \leq 1$. As before, we claim

$$[d(Y_n(\alpha,\cdot),y) < r] \subset [z \cdot Y_n(t) > K].$$

To see this notice if $\omega \in LHS$, then

$$\begin{aligned} z\cdot Y_n(t)(\omega) &= (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\rho_{i-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})(Y_n(\phi_j,t_i) - Y_n(\phi_j,t_{i-1})) \\ &= (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\rho_{i-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})(y_j(t_i) - y_j(t_{i-1})) \\ &\quad + (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\rho_{i-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})(Y_n(\phi_j,t_i) - y_j(t_i)) \\ &\quad - (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\rho_{i-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})(Y_n(\phi_j,t_{i-1}) - y_j(t_{i-1})) \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |z\cdot Y_n(t)(\omega)| &\geq (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}|\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})(y_j(t_i) - y_j(t_{i-1}))| \\ &\quad - (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\rho_{i-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})|Y_n(\phi_j,t_i) - y_j(t_i)| \\ &\quad - (1+\kappa)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\rho_{i-1}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j(\gamma_{i-1})|Y_n(\phi_j,t_{i-1}) - y_j(t_{i-1})| \\ &\geq K + 1 - 2(1+\kappa)^{-1}\epsilon p\sum_{j=1}^{N}\|p_j\| = K. \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is similar to the case of Hilbert space.

□

Let

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{y}^* \in D_{\mathbb{H}^*}[0,\infty) : T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) < \infty, \quad \text{for all} \quad t > 0\}. \tag{4.26}$$

REMARK 4.12. *Part (iii) of Theorem 4.9 indicates that if for $(x, y) \in D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$, $I_\alpha(x, y) < \infty$, then $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}$, where $\mathbf{y}^*$ is defined by (4.20).*

For $g \in D_{\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)$, define

$$g_\delta(t) = \sum_k g(\tau_k^\delta) 1_{[\tau_k^\delta, \tau_{k+1}^\delta)}(t)$$

where the τ_k^δ are defined by:

$$\tau_0^\delta = 0,$$
$$\tau_{k+1}^\delta = \inf\left\{s > \tau_k^\delta : |g(s) - g(\tau_k^\delta)| > \delta\right\}.$$

For $y \in D_{\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)$, note that

$$g_\delta \cdot y(t) = \sum_k g(\tau_k^\delta)^T (y(\tau_{k+1}^\delta \wedge t) - y(\tau_k^\delta \wedge t)).$$

Recall that for $h \in \mathbb{H}$, the notation $P_N(h)$ was defined at the beginning of the Section 4.2.

LEMMA 4.13. *For $\eta > 0$ and $a > 0$, there exist sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large $N > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[d(X_{n-} \cdot Y_n, (P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N, \cdot)) > 2\eta\right] \le -a.$$

PROOF. Since $\{X_n\}$ is exponentially tight, it satisfies the exponential compact containment condition. Thus, there exists a compact set K_a, such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[X_n(t) \notin K_a, \text{ for some } t < a\right] \le -a/3.$$

Let $\tau_{n,a} = \inf\{s : X_n(s) \notin K_a\}$. Then notice that

$$P\left[\tau_{n,a} < a\right] = P\left[X_n(t) \notin K_a, \text{ for some } t < a\right].$$

Hence,

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[\tau_{n,a} < a\right] \le -a/3. \tag{4.27}$$

Since $S_N(x) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^N p_k(x)\phi_k \to x$ as $N \to \infty$ uniformly over compact sets (see Lemma A.15 in Appendix), choose $N > 0$ such that $\sup_{x\in K_a} \|S_N(x) - x\| \le \epsilon$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is to be specified later. Therefore

$$\sup_{s<\tau_{n,a}} \|S_N(X_n(s)) - X_n(s)\| \le \epsilon. \tag{4.28}$$

Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} d(S_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n, X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) &\le \int_0^\infty e^{-u}\sup_{t\ge 0}|S_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n(t\wedge u) - X_{n-}\cdot Y_n(t\wedge u)|\wedge 1\; du \\ &\le \int_0^{\tau_{n,a}-}(\dots) + \int_{\tau_{n,a}}^\infty (\dots) \\ &\le \sup_{s<\tau_{n,a}} |S_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n(s) - X_{n-}\cdot Y_n(s)| + e^{-\tau_{n,a}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Note that by our notation,

$$P_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot) = S_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n = \sum_{j=1}^N \int p_j(X_n(s-))\; dY_k(\phi_k, s).$$

Let $t>0$ be such that $e^{-t}<\eta$, and notice that for any $t>0$, by the definition of the metric d

$$\begin{aligned} d(P_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot),(P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot)) &\le \sup_{s\le t}|(P_N(X_{n-})-(P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta)\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot)(s)| \\ &\quad + e^{-t}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

Thus, using (4.29) and (4.30),

$$\begin{aligned} d(X_{n-}\cdot Y_n,(P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot)) &\le \sup_{s<\tau_{n,a}} |S_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n(s) - X_{n-}\cdot Y_n(s)| + e^{-\tau_{n,a}} \\ &\quad + \sup_{s\le t}|(P_N(X_{n-})-(P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta)\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot)(s)| + e^{-t}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} [d(X_{n-}\cdot Y_n,(P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot))>2\eta] &\subset \left[\sup_{s<\tau_{n,a}} |S_N(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n(s) - X_{n-}\cdot Y_n(s)| > \eta/3\right] \\ &\quad \cup \left[e^{-\tau_{n,a}}>\eta/3\right] \\ &\quad \cup \left[\sup_{s\le t}|(P_N(X_{n-})-(P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta)\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot)(s)| \right. \\ &\qquad \left. >\eta/3\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $a>-\log\eta/3$. Choose $\epsilon=\delta$ such that

$$\epsilon K(t,a/3)<\eta/3.$$

Then using (4.28) and the uniform exponential tightness of $\{Y_n\}$ (3.1), it follows that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P\left[d(X_{n-}\cdot Y_n,(P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot))>\eta\right]\le -a.$$

□

THEOREM 4.14. *Suppose for* $(x,y,z)\in D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty\times\mathbb{R}}[0,\infty)$, $\mathbf{y}^*$ *defined by (4.20)* $\in\mathcal{D}$.

(i) *If* $z \neq x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$, *then*

$$J_\alpha(x, y, z) = \infty.$$

(ii) *If* $z = x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$, *then*

$$J_\alpha(x, y, z) = I_\alpha(x, y).$$

PROOF. (i) Fix an $a > 0$. By the hypothesis, there exists an $\eta > 0$ such that

$$d(z, x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*) > 4\eta > 0. \tag{4.31}$$

For this η, choose $N > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that the conclusion of Lemma 4.13 is satisfied. In fact, choose $N > 0$ large enough, and $\delta > 0$ small enough, so that

$$d(x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*, (P_N(x))_\delta \cdot \mathbf{y}^*(\alpha_N, \cdot)) < 2\eta,$$

where $\mathbf{y}^*(\alpha_N, \cdot) \equiv (\mathbf{y}^*(\phi_1, \cdot), \dots, \mathbf{y}^*(\phi_N, \cdot)) = (y_1, \dots, y_N) = y^{(N)}$. Then,

$$d(z, (P_N(x))_\delta \cdot \mathbf{y}^*(\alpha_N, \cdot)) > 2\eta.$$

Define a function $G^\delta : D_{\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0, \infty) \to D_{\mathbb{R}}[0, \infty)$ by

$$G^\delta(h, u) = (P_N(h))_\delta \cdot u^{(N)}.$$

Take δ smaller (if necessary) so that G^δ is continuous at (x, y).
Then there exists an $r > 0$ such that

$$G^\delta(B_r(x, y)) \subset B_\eta(x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*). \tag{4.32}$$

Next, observe that

$$\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot)) \in B_r(x, y), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z), d((P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n) \le 2\eta\} = \emptyset,$$

as otherwise, by (4.32)

$$d((P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N, \cdot), x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*) < \eta.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d(z, x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*) < d(z, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n) &+ d((P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n) \\ &+ d((P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N, \cdot), x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*) \quad < 4\eta, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to (4.31). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot)) \in B_r(x, y), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z)\} = \{&(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot)) \in B_r(x, y), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z), \\ &d((P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n) > 2\eta\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.13

$$\begin{aligned} -J_\alpha(x, y, z) &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot)) \in B_r(x, y), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z)\right] \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P\left[d((P_N(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n) > 2\eta\right] \le -a. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for all $a > 0$, we are done.

(ii) Since $z = x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$, for every $\eta > 0$ we can find $N > 0$ such that

$$d((x, y, z), (x, y, P_N(x) \cdot y^{(N)})) < \eta.$$

From (4.17) and (4.19),

$$J_\alpha^N(x, y, P_N(x) \cdot y^{(N)})) = I_\alpha(x, y).$$

Recall that

$$J_\alpha(x, y, z) = \sup_{\eta>0} \liminf_{m\to\infty} J_\alpha^m(B_\eta((x, y, z))).$$

It follows that

$$J_\alpha(x, y, z) \le I_\alpha(x, y).$$

Since the reverse inequality is always true by the contraction principle, the theorem follows. □

We summarize our results in the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.15. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space and $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ a pseudo-basis of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying (ii) of Theorem A.13. Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$-adapted, standard $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\mathbb{H}$-valued processes. Assume that $\{Y_n\}$ is UET. If $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a LDP in the sense of Definition 4.2, then $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ also satisfies a LDP. The associated rate function of the tuple $\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ can be expressed as*

$$J_\alpha(x, y, z) \quad = \begin{cases} I_\alpha(x, y), & z = x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}. \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{4.33}$$

where $\alpha = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots,), Y_n(\alpha, \cdot) = (Y_n(\phi_1, \cdot), Y_n(\phi_2, \cdot), \ldots)$, $\mathbf{y}^*$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are defined by (4.20) and (4.26) respectively.

4.3. *LDP results for stochastic integrals: $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingale.* Analogous to Theorem 4.8, we have our theorem on the large deviation principle of the stochastic integrals with respect to a sequence of $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingale. The development of the proof is almost exactly similar to that of Theorem 4.8.

THEOREM 4.16. *Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$-adapted, standard $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^\#$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$- valued processes. Assume that $\{Y_n\}$ is UET. If $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a LDP in the sense of Definition 4.2 with the rate function family $\{I_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$, then $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ also satisfies a LDP.*

4.3.1. *Identification of the rate function.* As before, we follow the process of identification of the rate function of the tuple $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ in Theorem 4.16. Again we assume that $\mathbb{H}$ is a separable Banach space with a pseudo-basis $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ satisfying (ii) of Theorem A.13 . The notation used in the beginning of Section 4.2 is used here as well. The following theorem is the analogue of Theorem 4.9 and the proof is almost exactly the same.

THEOREM 4.17. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space. Choose a pseudo-basis $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying ((ii)) of Theorem A.13. Suppose that $\{Y_n\}$ is a UET sequence. Suppose that for $(x, y) \in D_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0, \infty)$, $I_\alpha(x, y) < \infty$. Then,*

(i) *for every compact set* $C \subset \mathbb{H}$,

$$\sup_{t\leq T}\sup_{h\in C}|\sum_{j=M}^{N} y_j(t)p_j(h)| \to 0, \quad as \quad M, N \to \infty.$$

(ii) *for every* $t > 0$, $\mathbf{y}^*(t) \in \mathbb{H}^*$, *where* $\mathbf{y}^*(t) \equiv \sum_j y_j(t)p_j$

(iii) *for every* $t > 0$, $T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) < \infty$.

We next state an approximation result similar to Lemma 4.13. Recall that $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ is the completion of the linear space $\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \equiv \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{l}\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{ij}f_i\phi_j : f_i \in \{f_i\}, \phi_j \in \{\phi_j\}\right\}$ with respect to a suitable norm $\|\cdot\|_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}}$.

For $h = \sum_{i=1}^{L}\sum_{j=1}^{M} a_{ij}f_i\phi_j$, define $Q_{l,m} : \widehat{\mathcal{H}} \to \mathbb{L}^m$ by

$$Q_{l,m}(h) = (\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_{i1}f_i, \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_{i2}f_i, \ldots, \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_{im}f_i).$$

For $g \in D_{\mathbb{L}^k}[0,\infty)$ define

$$g_\delta(t) = \sum_k g(\tau_k^\delta)1_{[\tau_k^\delta,\tau_{k+1}^\delta)}(t)$$

where the τ_k^δ are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_0^\delta &= 0,\\ \tau_{k+1}^\delta &= \inf\left\{s > \tau_k^\delta : \|g(s) - g(\tau_k^\delta)\|_{\mathbb{L}} > \delta\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

For $y \in D_{\mathbb{R}^k}[0,\infty)$, define that,

$$g_\delta \cdot y(t) = \sum_k g(\tau_k^\delta)^T(y(\tau_{k+1}^\delta \wedge t) - y(\tau_k^\delta \wedge t)).$$

where for $(f_1,\ldots,f_m)^T \in \mathbb{L}^k$ and $(y_1,\ldots,y_k)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$(f_1,\ldots,f_m)(y_1,\ldots,y_k)^T = \sum_i y_if_i \in \mathbb{L}.$$

Recall that the c_{ij} are defined by (2.4) in Chapter 2.

Lemma 4.18. *For* $\eta > 0$ *and* $a > 0$, *there exist sufficiently small* $\epsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$ *and sufficiently large* $l, m > 0$ *such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P\left[d(X_{n-}\cdot Y_n, (Q_{l,m}(X_{n-}^\epsilon))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot)) > 2\eta\right] \leq -a,$$

where $X_n^\epsilon(s) = \sum_{i,j}^{l,m} c_{ij}^\epsilon(X_n(s))f_i\phi_j$.

Proof. Since $\{X_n\}$ is exponentially tight, it satisfies the exponential compact containment condition. Thus, there exists a compact set K_a such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[X_n(t) \notin K_a,\ \text{for some } t < a\right] \leq -a/3.$$

Let $\tau_{n,a} = \inf\{s : X_n(s) \notin K_a\}$. Then notice that

$$P[\tau_{n,a} < a] = P[X_n(t) \notin K_a, \text{ for some } t < a].$$

Hence,

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log P[\tau_{n,a} < a] \leq -a/3. \tag{4.34}$$

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists $l, m > 0$ such that defining

$$x^\epsilon = \sum_{i,j}^{l,m} c^\epsilon_{ij}(x) f_i \phi_j$$

we have

$$\|x^\epsilon - x\| \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{for all } x \in K_a$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is to be specified later.
Hence,

$$\sup_{s < \tau_{n,a}} \|X^\epsilon_n(s) - X_n(s)\| \leq \epsilon. \tag{4.35}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d(X^\epsilon_{n-} \cdot Y_n, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n) &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-u} \sup_{t \geq 0} |X^\epsilon_{n-} \cdot Y_n(t \wedge u) - X_{n-} \cdot Y_n(t \wedge u)| \wedge 1 \, du \\ &\leq \int_0^{\tau_{n,a}-} (\dots) + \int_{\tau_{n,a}}^\infty (\dots) \\ &\leq \sup_{s < \tau_{n,a}} |X^\epsilon_{n-} \cdot Y_n(s) - X_{n-} \cdot Y_n(s)| + e^{-\tau_{n,a}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

Note that by our notation,

$$Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}) \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m, \cdot) = X^\epsilon_{n-} \cdot Y_n = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{m} f_i \int c_{i,j}(X_n(s-)) \, dY_k(\phi_j, s).$$

Let $t > 0$ be such that $e^{-t} < \eta$ and notice that for any $t > 0$, by the definition of the metric d

$$\begin{aligned} d(Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}) \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m, \cdot), (Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m, \cdot)) \leq \sup_{s \leq t} |(Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}) - (Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta) \cdot \\ Y_n(\alpha_m, \cdot)(s)| + e^{-t}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

Thus using (4.36) and (4.37),

$$\begin{aligned} d(X_{n-} \cdot Y_n, (Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m, \cdot)) \leq \sup_{s < \tau_{n,a}} &|X^\epsilon_{n-} \cdot Y_n(s) - X_{n-} \cdot Y_n(s)| + e^{-\tau_{n,a}} \\ &+ \sup_{s \leq t} |(Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}) - (Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta) \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m, \cdot)(s)| \\ &+ e^{-t}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{d(X_{n-}\cdot Y_n,(Q_{l,m}(X^{\epsilon}_{n-}))_\delta\cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot))>2\eta\right\}\subset &\left\{\sup_{s<\tau_{n,a}}|X^{\epsilon}_{n-}\cdot Y_n(s)-X_{n-}\cdot Y_n(s)|>\eta/3\right\}\\ &\cup\left\{e^{-\tau_{n,a}}>\eta/3\right\}\\ &\cup\left\{\sup_{s\le t}|(Q_{l,m}(X^{\epsilon}_{n-})-(Q_{l,m}(X^{\epsilon}_{n-}))_\delta)\cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot)(s)|\right.\\ &\qquad\left.>\eta/3\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $a>-\log\eta/3$. Choose $\epsilon=\delta$ such that

$$\epsilon K(t,a/3)<\eta/3.$$

Then using (4.35) and uniform exponential tightness (3.1), it follows that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P\left[d(X_{n-}\cdot Y_n,(Q_{l,m}(X^{\epsilon}_{n-}))_\delta\cdot Y_n(\alpha_N,\cdot))>\eta\right]\le -a.$$

□

THEOREM 4.19. *Suppose for* $(x,y,z)\in D_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty\times\mathbb{L}}[0,\infty)$, $\mathbf{y}^*$ *defined by* (4.20) $\in\mathcal{D}$.

(i) *If* $z\neq x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*$, *then*

$$J_\alpha(x,y,z)=\infty.$$

(ii) *If* $z=x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*$, *then*

$$J_\alpha(x,y,z)=I_\alpha(x,y).$$

PROOF. (i) Fix an $a>0$. By the hypothesis, there exists an $\eta>0$ such that

$$d(z,x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*)>4\eta>0. \tag{4.38}$$

For this η, choose $l,m>0$ and $\epsilon,\delta>0$ such that conclusion of Lemma 4.18 is satisfied. In fact, choose $l,m>0$ large enough and $\delta>0$ small enough so that

$$d(x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*,(Q_{l,m}(x^\epsilon))_\delta\cdot\mathbf{y}^*(\alpha_m,\cdot))<2\eta,$$

where $x^\epsilon=\sum_{i,j}^{l,m}c^{\epsilon}_{ij}(x)f_i\phi_j$, $\mathbf{y}^*(\alpha_m,\cdot)\equiv(\mathbf{y}^*(\phi_1,\cdot),\dots,\mathbf{y}^*(\phi_m,\cdot))=(y_1,\dots,y_m)=y^{(m)}$. Then

$$d(z,(Q_{l,m}(x^\epsilon))_\delta\cdot\mathbf{y}^*(\alpha_m,\cdot))>2\eta.$$

Define a function $G^{\delta,\epsilon}:D_{\widehat{\mathbb{H}}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)\to D_{\mathbb{R}}[0,\infty)$ by

$$G^{\delta,\epsilon}(h,u)=(Q_{l,m}(h^\epsilon))_\delta\cdot u^{(m)}.$$

Take δ,ϵ smaller (if necessary) so that $G^{\delta,\epsilon}$ is continuous at (x,y).
Then there exists an $r>0$ such that

$$G^{\delta,\epsilon}(B_r(x,y))\subset B_\eta(x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*). \tag{4.39}$$

Next, observe that

$$\big\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot)) \in B_r(x,y), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z), d((Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) \le 2\eta\big\} = \emptyset.$$

as otherwise, by (4.39)

$$d((Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot), x\cdot \mathbf{y}^*) < \eta.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d(z, x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*) < d(z, X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) + d((Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) \\ + d((Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot), x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*) \quad < 4\eta. \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to (4.38). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot)) \in B_r(x,y), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z)\} = \{&(X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot)) \in B_r(x,y), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z), \\ &d((Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) > 2\eta\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.18

$$\begin{aligned} -J_\alpha(x,y,z) &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[(X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot)) \in B_r(x,y), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n \in B_\eta(z)\right] \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log P\left[d((Q_{l,m}(X_{n-}))_\delta \cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot), X_{n-}\cdot Y_n) > 2\eta\right] \le -a. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for all $a > 0$, we are done.

(ii) Since $z = x\cdot\mathbf{y}^*$, for every $\eta > 0$, we can find $l, m > 0$ such that

$$d((x,y,z),(x,y,Q_{l,m}(x^\epsilon)\cdot y^{(m)})) < \eta.$$

Let $J^{l,m}_\alpha$ denote the rate function for

$$Q_{l,m}(X^\epsilon_{n-})\cdot Y_n(\alpha_m,\cdot) = X^\epsilon_{n-}\cdot Y_n = \sum_{i=1}^{l}\sum_{j=1}^{m} f_i \int c_{i,j}(X_n(s-))\, dY_k(\phi_j,s).$$

By the finite-dimensional result of Garcia [18]

$$J^{l,m}_\alpha(x,y,Q_{l,m}(x^\epsilon)\cdot y^{(m)})) = I_\alpha(x,y).$$

Since

$$J_\alpha(x,y,z) = \sup_{\eta>0}\liminf_{l,m\to\infty} J^{l,m}_\alpha(B_\eta((x,y,z))),$$

it follows that

$$J_\alpha(x,y,z) \le I_\alpha(x,y).$$

As the reverse inequality is always true by the contraction principle, the theorem follows. □

We summarize our results in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.20. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space and $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ a pseudo-basis of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying (ii) of Theorem A.13. Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted, standard $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^{\#}$-semimartingales and $\{X_n\}$ a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ valued processes. Assume $\{Y_n\}$ is UET. If $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a LDP in the sense of Definition 4.2, then $\{(X_n, Y_n, X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ also satisfies a LDP. The associated rate function of the tuple $\{(X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot), X_{n-} \cdot Y_n)\}$ can be expressed as*

$$J_\alpha(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} I_\alpha(x,y), & z = x\cdot \mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}. \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{4.40}$$

where $\alpha = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots,), Y_n(\alpha, \cdot) = (Y_n(\phi_1, \cdot), Y_n(\phi_2, \cdot), \ldots)$, $\mathbf{y}^*$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are defined by (4.20) and (4.26) respectively.

5. LDP for stochastic differential equation.

5.1. $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-*semimartingale.*

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space and $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ a pseudo-basis of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying (ii) of Theorem A.13. Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of uniformly exponentially tight $\{\mathcal{F}^n_t\}$-adapted, standard $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingales, $\{X_n\}$ a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued processes and $\{U_n\}$ a sequence of adapted $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued cadlag processes. Suppose that $\{(U_n, Y_n)\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with the rate function family $\{I_\beta(\cdot,\cdot)\}$. Assume that $F : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{H}$ is a continuous function and X_n satisfies*

$$X_n(t) = U_n(t) + F(X_{n-}) \cdot Y_n(t).$$

For $y \in D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$, define $\mathbf{y}^*$ by (4.20). Suppose that for every $(u, y) \in D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$ for which $I_\alpha(u, y) < \infty$, the solution to

$$x = u + F(x) \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$$

is unique. Assume further that $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n)\}$ is exponentially tight. Then the sequence $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot))\}$ satisfies a LDP in $D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$ with the rate function given by

$$J_\alpha(u,x,y) = \begin{cases} I_\alpha(u,y), & x = u + F(x)\cdot \mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}. \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is defined by (4.26).

Proof. We borrow ideas from the proof of Theorem 8.2 of Garcia [18]. To prove that $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot))\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle, its enough to prove that for every subsequence of $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot)\}$, there exists a further subsequence which satisfies a LDP with the same rate function J_α. Since for every exponentially tight sequence there exists a subsequence which satisfies a LDP, we can assume that $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot))\}$ satisfies a LDP with the rate function J_α, and then show that the expression of J_α does not depend on the choice of a subsequence.
Let $(u, x, y) \in D_{R^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$. Notice that if $\mathbf{y}^*$ defined by (4.20) is not in $\mathcal{D}$, then $J_\alpha(u, x, y) = \infty$ by Theorem 4.11 and (iii).
Next suppose that $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}$, but $x \neq u + F(x) \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$. We will prove that in this case

$$J_\alpha(u, x, y) = \infty.$$

Notice that by the contraction principle, $\{(U_n, F(X_n), Y_n(\alpha, \cdot))\}$ satisfies a LDP with the rate function

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}_\alpha(u, z, y) = \inf_q \{J_\alpha(u, q, y) : F(q) = z\}.$$

It follows from Theorem 4.15 that $\{(U_n, F(X_n), Y_n(\alpha,\cdot), F(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n)\}$ satisfies a LDP with the rate function

$$\Lambda_\alpha(u,z,y,p) = \begin{cases} \inf_q \{J_\alpha(u,q,y) : F(u) = z\}, & p = z\cdot \mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}. \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $X_n = U_n + F(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n$, it now follows from the contraction principle that $\{(U_n, F(X_n), X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot))\}$ satisfies the LDP with the rate function given by

$$\widetilde{J}_\alpha(u,z,x,y) = \begin{cases} \inf_q \{J_\alpha(u,q,y) : F(q) = z\}, & x = u + z\cdot \mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}. \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.2}$$

On the other hand, notice that since $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot))\}$ satisfies LDP with rate function J_α, the contraction principle yields

$$\widetilde{J}_\alpha(u,z,x,y) = \begin{cases} J_\alpha(u,x,y), & \text{if } z = F(x), \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

We will prove that if $x \neq u + F(x)\cdot \mathbf{y}^*$, then for all z

$$\widetilde{J}_\alpha(u,z,x,y) = \infty.$$

Then taking infimum over all z, we see that $J_\alpha(u,x,y) = \infty$.

Case 1: $x \neq u + F(x)\cdot \mathbf{y}^*$
Fix a z. Notice that if $x \neq u + z\cdot\mathbf{y}^*$, $\widetilde{J}_\alpha(u,z,x,y) = \infty$. So suppose that $x = u + z\cdot \mathbf{y}^*$. Then from the assumption we find that $z \neq F(x)$. It follows from (5.3) that, $\widetilde{J}_\alpha(u,z,x,y) = \infty$.

Next assume that $x = u + F(x)\cdot\mathbf{y}^*$. We will prove that $J_\alpha(u,x,y) = I_\alpha(u,y)$.
Case 2: $x = u + F(x)\cdot \mathbf{y}^*$
If $I_\alpha(u,y) = \infty$, clearly $J_\alpha(u,x,y) = \infty$. So, assume that $I_\alpha(u,y) < \infty$. Then there exists a q such that $J_\alpha(u,q,y) < \infty$. From *Case 1* it follows that $q = u + F(q)\cdot\mathbf{y}^*$. By the uniqueness assumption, it follows that $q = x$. Hence we have

$$J_\alpha(u,x,y) = J_\alpha(u,q,y), \text{for all } q \text{ such that } J_\alpha(u,q,y) < \infty.$$

It follows

$$J_\alpha(u,x,y) = \inf_q J_\alpha(u,q,y) = I_\alpha(u,y).$$

□

The above theorem can be extended to cover stochastic differential equations of the type

$$X_n(t) = U_n + F_n(X_{n-})\cdot Y_n.$$

where the $F_n : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{H}$ are measurable functions satisfying some suitable conditions.

THEOREM 5.2. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a separable Banach space and $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ a pseudo-basis of $\mathbb{H}$ satisfying (ii) of Theorem A.13. Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of uniformly exponentially tight $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$-adapted, $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingales, $\{X_n\}$ a sequence of cadlag, adapted $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued processes and $\{U_n\}$ a sequence of adapted $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued cadlag processes. Suppose $\{(U_n, Y_n\}$ satisfies large deviation principle with the rate function family $\{I_\beta(\cdot,\cdot)\}$. Assume that $F, F_n : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{H}$ are measurable functions such that*

- *for all x whenever $x_n \to x$, $F_n(x_n) \to F(x)$.*

Suppose that X_n satisfies

$$X_n(t) = U_n(t) + F_n(X_{n-}) \cdot Y_n(t).$$

For $y \in D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$, define $\mathbf{y}^*$ by (4.20). Suppose that for every $(u,y) \in D_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$ for which $I_\alpha(u,y) < \infty$, the solution to

$$x = u + F(x) \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$$

is unique. Assume further that $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n)\}$ is exponentially tight. Then the sequence $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n(\alpha,\cdot))\}$ satisfies a LDP with the rate function given by

$$J_\alpha(u,x,y) \quad = \begin{cases} I_\alpha(u,y), & x = u + F(x)\cdot \mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}. \\ \infty, & \textit{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. The proof is almost exactly same as the above theorem once we apply a generalized version of the contraction principle (see Theorem A.1) instead of the usual one. ☐

Example 5.3. [**LDP for Markov chains**]
Let $\{X^n_k\}$ be a Markov Chain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$X^n_{k+1} = X^n_k + \frac{1}{n} b(X^n_k, \xi_{k+1}),$$

where the ξ_k are iid with distribution π. We want a LDP for $\left\{X^n(t) \equiv X^n_{[nt]}\right\}$. Define

$$M_n(\Gamma, t) = \sum_{k=1}^{[nt]} 1_\Gamma(\xi_k).$$

and notice that,

$$X^n(t) = X_0 + \frac{1}{n}\int_{E\times[0,t)} b(X^n(s), u) M_n(du \times ds).$$

Now M_n is a counting measure with mean measure $\pi \otimes \mu_n$, where $\mu_n[0,t] = [nt]$. Consider M_n as an $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale, for $\mathbb{H} = M^\Phi(\pi) \subset L^\Phi(\pi)$ (see Definition A.1), with $\Phi(x) = e^x - 1$. Assume that b is Lipschitz in the first argument and $\sup_x \|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi < \infty$.
To prove that $\{X^n\}$ satisfies a LDP we have to carry out the following three steps: prove 1) UET of $\{Y_n \equiv M_n/n\}$ 2) LDP of $\{Y_n \equiv M_n/n\}$ 3) exponential tightness of the solution $\{X^n\}$
The LDP of $\{X^n\}$ will then come from Theorem 5.1.

Step 1: The proof that $\{Y_n \equiv M_n/n\}$ is UET is similar to that of Poisson random measure in Example 3.3. Let $Z(u,s)$ be a cadlag process such that $\sup_{s\le t}\|Z(\cdot,s)\|_\Phi \le 1$. Observe that without loss of generality we can take $Z \ge 0$ for our purpose.
Call $H_n(t) \equiv Z_- \cdot M_n(t)$. Then as in Example 3.3, apply Itô's lemma to get

$$E(e^{H_n(t)}) = 1 + nE\int_0^t e^{H_n(s)} \int_E (e^{Z(u,s)} - 1)\pi(du)\mu_n(ds).$$

Now since $\|f\|_\Phi \leq 1$ iff $\int \Phi(|f|)\, d\nu \leq 1$, we see from our assumption on the process Z that $\sup_{s\leq t}\int_U (e^{Z(u,s)}-1)d\nu(u) \leq 1$. Thus,

$$E(e^{H_n(t)}) \leq 1 + E\int_0^t e^{H_n(s)}\mu_n(ds),$$

and by Gronwall's inequality

$$E(e^{H_n(t)}) = E(e^{Z_-\cdot Y_n(t)}) \leq e^{[nt]}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P(\sup_{s\leq t} Z_-\cdot Y_n(s) > K) &= P(Z_-\cdot M_n(t) > nK) = P(e^{Z_-\cdot M_n(t)} > e^{nK}) \\ &\leq E(e^{Z_-\cdot M_n(t)})/e^{nK} \leq e^{nt-nK}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $k(t,a) \equiv K = t+a$, we have

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log \sup P\left[\sup_{s\leq t}|Z_-\cdot Y_n(s)| > k(t,a)\right] \leq -a.$$

Step 2: To prove that $\{Y_n \equiv M_n/n\}$ satisfies a LDP, we have to show that for any finite collection $h = (h_1, \dots h_m)$ in $M^\Phi(\pi)$

$$\{Y_n(h,\cdot) \equiv (Y_n(h_1,\cdot),\dots,Y_n(h_m,\cdot))\}$$

satisfies a LDP in $D_{\mathbb{R}^m}[0,\infty)$. Notice that

$$M_n(h,t) = \sum_{k=1}^{[nt]} h(\xi_k)$$

where addition is taken component wise. Define

$$H(p) = \log\int_{R^d} e^{p\cdot h(z)}\pi(dz),$$

and take L to be the Frenchel-Legendre transform of H, that is

$$L(q) = \sup_{p\in\mathbb{R}^d}\{p\cdot q - H(p)\}.$$

By a functional version of Cramer's theorem, $\left\{Y_n(h,\cdot) = \frac{1}{n}M_n(h,\cdot)\right\}$ satisfies a LDP with the rate function given by

$$I_h(y^{(m)}) = \begin{cases} \int_0^\infty L(\dot{y}^{(m)}(s)), & \text{if } y^{(m)} = (y_1,\dots,y_m) \text{ is absolutely continuous} \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

Thus if $\alpha = (\phi_1,\phi_2,\dots)$ is a basis for $M^\Phi(\pi)$, then

$$I_\alpha(y) = \sup_m I_{\alpha_m}(y^{(m)}), \quad y = (y_1,y_2,\dots)$$

where $\alpha_m = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_m)$.

Step 3: For simplicity of the calculation we will assume $d = 1$. By Itô's lemma,

$$e^{nX^n(t+h)} = e^{nX^n(t)} + \int_{U\times[t,t+h)} e^{nX^n(s-)}(e^{b(X^n(s-),u)} - 1)M_n(du \times ds)$$

It follows that,

$$E(e^{n(X^n(t+h)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) = 1 + E\int_{U\times[t,t+h)} e^{n(X^n(s-)-X^n(t))}(e^{b(X^n(s-),u)} - 1)\pi(du)\mu_n(ds)|\mathcal{F}^n_t).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} E(e^{n(X^n(t+h)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) &\le 1 + nE\int_{U\times[0,h)} e^{n(X^n(t+s-)-X^n(t))}(e^{b(X^n(t+s-),u)} - 1)\pi(du)ds|\mathcal{F}^n_t) \\ &\le 1 + n\sup_x \|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi \int_0^h E(e^{n(X^n(t+s-)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t)ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality

$$E(e^{n(X^n(t+h)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) \le e^{n\sup_x \|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi h}.$$

Similarly

$$E(e^{-n(X^n(t+h)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) \le e^{n\sup_x \|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi h},$$

and it follows that

$$E(e^{n|X^n(t+h)-X^n(t)|}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) \le 2e^{n\sup_x \|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi h}.$$

Now, the exponential tightness of $\{X^n\}$ follows from Theorem 4.1 of Feng and Kurtz [13] and Theorem 5.1 gives the LDP of $\{X^n\}$ with the rate function given by

$$J(x) = \inf_{\mathbf{y}^*} \left\{ I_\alpha(y) : \dot{x}(s) = b(x(s),\cdot)\cdot \mathbf{y}^*(ds) \right\}.$$

Example 5.4. [**LDP for random evolutions**] Let E be a complete and separable metric space. Let $\{\xi_k\}$ be a $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$-Markov chain in E with the transition kernel P. Consider the evolution equation

$$X^n_{k+1} = X^n_k + \frac{1}{n}b(X^n_k, \xi_{k+1}).$$

By a slight abuse of notation, put $\xi_n(t) = \xi_{[nt]}$, $X^n(t) = X^n_{[nt]}$. We wish to find a LDP for $\{X^n\}$. Note that for each n, $\{X^n\}$ is adapted to the filtration $\left\{\mathcal{F}^n_t = \mathcal{F}_{[nt]}\right\}$.

Define

$$M_n(\Gamma, t) = \sum_{k=1}^{[nt]} 1_\Gamma(\xi_k),$$

and notice that X^n satisfies

$$X^n(t) = X^n_0 + \frac{1}{n}\int_{E\times[0,t)} b(X^n(s), u)M_n(du \times ds).$$

Define $\widetilde{M_n}$ by

$$\widetilde{M_n}(\Gamma,t)=\sum_{k=1}^{[nt]}(1_\Gamma(\xi_k)-P(\xi_{k-1},\Gamma)).$$

Notice that for each Γ, $\widetilde{M_n}(\Gamma,\cdot)$ is a martingale. Define the random measure μ_n by

$$\mu_n(\Gamma,t)=\sum_{k=1}^{[nt]}P(\xi_{k-1},\Gamma).$$

Then,

$$E(\int_{E\times[0,t)}H(u,s)M_n(du,ds))=E(\int_{E\times[0,t)}H(u,s)\mu_n(du,ds)).$$

Assume that there exists a σ-finite measure π such that the Radon-Nikodym derivatives

$$\frac{P(x,du)}{\pi(du)}\le C,\quad \text{for all } x,u.$$

Consider M_n as an $\mathbb{H}^\#$-semimartingale, for $\mathbb{H}=M^\Phi(\pi)\subset L^\Phi(\pi)$ with $\Phi(x)=e^x-1$. Assume that Assume that b is Lipschitz in the first argument $\sup_x\|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi<\infty$.
Again to prove that $\{X_n\}$ satisfies a LDP we have to carry out the following three steps: prove 1) UET of $\{Y_n\equiv M_n/n\}$ 2) exponential tightness of the solution $\{X_n\}$ 3) LDP of $\{Y_n\equiv M_n/n\}$. Theorem 5.1 will then give the required LDP of $\{X_n\}$.

Step 1: Let $Z(u,s)$ be a cadlag process such that $\sup_{s\le t}\|Z(\cdot,s)\|_\Phi\le 1$. Observe that without loss of generality we can take $Z\ge 0$ for our purpose.
Call $H_n(t)\equiv Z_-\cdot M_n(t)$. Then by Itô's lemma

$$f(H_n(t))=f(H_n(0))+\int_{U\times[0,t]}f(H_n(s-)+Z(u,s-))-f(H_n(s-))\ M_n(du,ds).$$

Therefore, taking $f(x)=e^x$,

$$\begin{aligned}E(e^{H_n(t)})&=1+E\int_{E\times[0,t)}e^{H_n(s)}(e^{Z(u,s)}-1)\mu_n(du,ds)\\&=1+\sum_{k=1}^{[nt]}\int_E e^{H_n(k/n)}(e^{Z(u,k/n)}-1)P(\xi_k,du)\\&\le 1+\sum_{k=1}^{[nt]}e^{H_n(k/n)}\sup_x\int_E(e^{Z(u,k/n)}-1)P(x,du)\\&=1+\sum_{k=1}^{[nt]}e^{H_n(k/n)}\sup_x\int_E(e^{Z(u,k/n)}-1)\frac{P(x,du)}{\pi(du)}\pi(du)\\&\le 1+C\sum_{k=1}^{[nt]}e^{H_n(k/n)}\int_E(e^{Z(u,k/n)}-1)\pi(du).\end{aligned}$$

Now since $\|f\|_\Phi\le 1$ iff $\int\Phi(|f|)\ d\nu\le 1$, we see from our assumption on the process Z that $\sup_{s\le t}\int_E(e^{Z(u,s)}-1)d\pi(u)\le 1$. Thus,

$$E(e^{H_n(t)})\le 1+CE\int_0^t e^{H_n(s)}\nu_n(ds),$$

where $\nu_n[0,t] = [nt]$. and by Gronwall's inequality

$$E(e^{H_n(t)}) = E(e^{Z_-\cdot M_n(t)}) \leq e^{C[nt]}.$$

Therefore

$$P(\sup_{s\leq t} n^{-1}Z_-\cdot M_n(s) > K) = P(Z_-\cdot M_n(t) > nK) = P(e^{Z_-\cdot M_n(t)} > e^{nK})$$
$$\leq E(e^{Z_-\cdot M_n(t)})/e^{nK} \leq e^{Cnt-nK}.$$

Choosing $k(t,a) \equiv K = Ct + a$, we see that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n}\log\sup P\left[\sup_{s\leq t} n^{-1}|Z_-\cdot M_n(s)| > k(t,a)\right] \leq -a.$$

This proves that the sequence $\{Y_n \equiv M_n/n\}$ is UET.
Step 2: By Itô's lemma,

$$e^{nX^n(t+h)} = e^{nX^n(t)} + \int_{U\times[t,t+h)} e^{nX^n(s-)}(e^{b(X^n(s-),u)} - 1)M_n(du\times ds).$$

Recall that $\mathcal{F}^n_t = \mathcal{F}_{[nt]}$. It follows that,

$$E(e^{n(X^n(t+h)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) = 1 + E\int_{U\times[t,t+h)} e^{n(X^n(s-)-X^n(t))}(e^{b(X^n(s-),u)} - 1)\mu_n(du,ds)|\mathcal{F}^n_t).$$

Hence

$$E(e^{n(X_n(t+h)-X_n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) \leq 1 + \sum_{nt\leq k<n(t+h))}\int_U e^{n(X^n(k/n)-X^n(t))}(e^{b(X^n(k/n),u)} - 1)P(\xi_{k-1},du)|\mathcal{F}_{[nt]})$$
$$\leq 1 + E(\sum_{nt\leq k<n(t+h))} e^{n(X^n(k/n)-X^n(t))}\int_U (e^{b(X^n(k/n),u)} - 1)\pi(du)|\mathcal{F}_{[nt]})$$
$$\leq 1 + \sup_x \|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi E(\sum_{nt\leq k<n(t+h))} e^{n(X^n(k/n)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}_{[nt]}).$$

By Gronwall's inequality (Theorem 5.1, Page 498, [12])

$$E(e^{n(X^n(t+h)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}^n_t) \leq e^{n\sup_x\|b(x,\cdot)\|_\Phi h}$$

and as before, exponential tightness of $\{X^n\}$ follows.

Step 3: It follows from Theorem 5.1 that if the sequence of occupation measures $\{Y_n = M_n/n\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with rate function I then $\{X_n\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with the rate function described there. Large deviations for occupation measures of Markov chain was first studied by Donsker and Varadhan in [9, 10]. Much of the subsequent work include relaxation of the original conditions and extension to certain classes of continuous time Markov processes [22, 25, 20, 8, 11, 7, 13]. In particular, the books [8, 11, 7, 13] are good sources for the topic. The following result is from [13].

Let $\mathcal{M}(E)$ be the space of finite, Borel measures on E with the topology being given by the weak convergence. Notice that the Y_n can be considered as cadlag processes on $\mathcal{M}(E)$, that is, $Y_n \in D_{\mathcal{M}(E)}[0,\infty)$. Also, let $C_b(E)$ denote the space of continuous and bounded function on E and $C_b(E)^+ \subset C_b(E)$ denote space of all functions $f \in C_b(E)$ with $\inf_{x\in E} f(x) > 0$.
Write

$$\mathcal{L}(E) = \{z \in \mathcal{M}(E \times [0,\infty)) : z(E \times [0,t]) = t, t \geq 0\}.$$

Topologize $\mathcal{L}(E)$ by weak convergence on bounded intervals, that is, $z_n \to z$ if

$$\int_{E\times[0,t]} f(u,s) z_n(du \times ds) \to \int_{E\times[0,t]} f(u,s) z(du \times ds), \quad t \geq 0$$

for all $f \in C_b(E \times [0,\infty))$. Denote $M_{\mathcal{P}(E)}[0,\infty)$ be the space of measurable $\mathcal{P}(E)$-valued functions on $[0,\infty)$. If $z \in \mathcal{L}(E)$, then there exists $\mu \in M_{\mathcal{P}(E)}[0,\infty)$ such that

$$z(C \times [0,t)) = \int_0^t \mu(C,s)\, ds.$$

We write $\dot{z}(t) = \mu(t)$. Conversely, if $\mu \in M_{\mathcal{P}(E)}[0,\infty)$, then z defined by the above relation is in $\mathcal{L}(E)$. Assume that the transition matrix P of the Markov chain $\{\xi_k\}$ satisfies the following uniform ergodicity condition (see Page 100, [8], Appendix B, [13]): there exist $l, N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $1 \leq l \leq N$ and $M \geq 1$ such that

$$P^l(x,\cdot) \leq \frac{M}{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} P^m(y,\cdot), \quad \text{for} \quad x, y \in E.$$

The above uniform ergodicity condition guarantees the existence of an unique invariant probability measure ν for P. Then $\{Y_n\}$ satisfies a LDP in $C_{\mathcal{M}(E)}[0,\infty)$ with rate function

$$I(y) = \begin{cases} \int_0^\infty I_P(\dot{y}(s))\, ds, & y \in \mathcal{L}(E) \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

where $I_P(\mu)$ is given by

$$I_P(\mu) = -\inf_{f\in C_b(E)^+} \int_E \log \frac{Pf}{f}.$$

Our next example is a Freidlin-Wetzell type small diffusion problem, where the driving integrator is space-time Gaussian white noise. These problems were first studied by Frieidlin and Wentzell in [36], for SDEs driven by standard one dimensional Brownian motion. Since their work, many original assumptions were significantly relaxed (see for example [1, 11]). Large deviations for diffusions driven by infinite-dimensional Wiener processes have been studied in [3] and [2]. Cho [4] considers the case when the driving integrators are continuous orthogonal martingale random measures.

Example 5.5. [**Freidlin - Wentzell type LDP I [16]**]
Let (E, r) be a complete and separable metric space and μ a sigma finite measure on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$. Let $F : R^d \times E \to \mathbb{R}^d$, be Lipschitz continuous, and L^2-bounded in the sense that $\|F\| \equiv \sup_x \|F(x,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mu)} < \infty$. Suppose $b : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded Lipschitz function with bound $\|b\| = \sup_x |b(x)| < \infty$. Denote $W_n \equiv n^{-1/2} W$, where W is the space time white noise on the

measure space$(E \times [0,\infty), \mu \otimes \lambda)$. Here λ denotes the Lebesgue measure on $[0,\infty)$. Assume that X_n satisfies

$$X_n(t) = x_0 + \int_{E\times[0,t)} F(X_n(s), u) W_n(ds \times du) + \int_0^t b(X_n(s))\, ds.$$

Step 1: Example 3.2 shows that $\{W_n\}$, indexed by $\mathbb{H} = L^2(\mu)$, is a sequence of uniformly exponentially tight $\mathbb{H}^{\#}$-semimartingales.

Step 2: As discussed in Example 4.4, $\{n^{-1/2} W\}$ satisfies LDP. For a finite collection $h = (h_1, \dots, h_m)$, $(W(h_1,\cdot), W(h_2,\cdot), \dots, W(h_m,\cdot))$ is a m-dimensional BM with diffusion matrix $t\,[\langle h_i, h_j\rangle]_{i,j=1}^m$. Thus by Schilder's theorem when h_i are orthogonal, the rate function

$$I_h(y) \quad = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^m \int_0^\infty |\dot{y}_i(t)|^2\, dt, & y_i(t) = \int_0^t \dot{y}_i(s)\, ds \text{ for some } \dot{y}_i \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

In fact if $\alpha = \{\phi_i\}$ forms a orthonormal basis, the rate function for $\{n^{-1/2}(W(\phi_1,\cdot), W(\phi_2,\cdot), \dots)\}$ is given by

$$I_\alpha(y) \quad = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_0^\infty |\dot{y}_i(t)|^2\, dt, & y_i(t) = \int_0^t \dot{y}_i(s)\, ds \text{ for some } \dot{y}_i \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Step 3: To show that $\{X_n\}$ is exponentially tight, observe that by Itô's lemma,

$$e^{nX_n(t+h)} = e^{nX_n(t)} + \int_t^{t+h} n e^{nX_n(s)} dX_n(s) + \frac{1}{2}\int_t^{t+h} n^2 e^{nX_n(s)} d\,[X_n]_s\,.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E(e^{n(X_n(t+h)-X_n(t))}|\mathcal{F}_t^n) &= 1 + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^h nE(e^{n(X_n(t+s)-X_n(t))}(\|F(X_n(s),\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 + b(X_n(s))|\mathcal{F}_t^n)\, ds \\ &\le 1 + \frac{n(\|F\|^2 + \|b\|)}{2}\int_0^h E(e^{X_n(t+s)-X_n(t)}|\mathcal{F}_t^n)\, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Gronwall's inequality,

$$E(e^{n(X_n(t+h)-X_n(t))}|\mathcal{F}_t^n) \le e^{n(\|F\|^2+\|b\|)h}.$$

Similarly,

$$E(e^{-n(X^n(t+h)-X^n(t))}|\mathcal{F}_t^n) \le e^{n(\|F\|^2+\|b\|)h},$$

and it follows that

$$E(e^{n|X^n(t+h)-X^n(t)|}|\mathcal{F}_t^n) \le 2e^{n(\|F\|^2+\|b\|)h}.$$

As before, Theorem 4.1 of Feng and Kurtz [13] implies that $\{X_n\}$ is exponentially tight.

Step 4: Let $\{\phi_k\}$ be an complete orthonormal system of $L^2(\mu)$. Put $\mathbf{y}^*(t) = \sum_k y_k(t)\phi_k$. Theorem 5.1 implies that $\{(X_n, n^{-1/2}W(\alpha,\cdot)\}$ satisfies large deviation principle with the rate function

$$J_\alpha(x,y) \quad = \begin{cases} I_\alpha(y), & x = x_0 + F(x)\cdot\mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

EXAMPLE 5.6. [**Freidlin - Wentzell type LDP II** [16]]
Consider the SDE

$$X_n(t) = x_0 + n^{-1/2}\int_{E\times[0,t)} \sigma_1(X_n(s),u)W(ds\times du) + \int_0^t b(X_n(s))\,ds \tag{5.8}$$

$$+\, n^{-1}\int_{U\times[0,t)} \sigma_2(X_n(s),u)\xi(n\,ds\times du). \tag{5.9}$$

Here ξ is a Poisson random measure on $U\times[0,\infty)$ with mean measure $d\nu\times dt$, and is independent of space-time white noise W. Assume that $\sigma_1,\sigma_2 : R^d\times E\to\mathbb{R}^d$, are Lipschitz continuous, $\|\sigma_1\|\equiv\sup_x\|\sigma_1(x,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mu)}<\infty$, $\|\sigma_2\|=\sup_x\|\sigma_2(x,\cdot)\|_{L^\Phi(\nu)}<\infty$, for $\Phi(x)=e^x-1$. Also assume that $b:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded Lipschitz function with bound $\|b\|=\sup_x|b(x)|<\infty$.

Step 1: This is same as *Step 2* in the previous example.

Step 2: By Example 4.5, $\{n^{-1}\xi(\cdot,n(\cdot)\}$ satisfies a LDP when the indexing space is taken to be the Morse-Transue space $M^\Phi(\nu)\subset L^\Phi(\nu)$ (see (A.1)) with $\Phi(x)=e^x-1$. For any finite collection $h=(h_1,\dots,h_m)$ in $M^\Phi(\nu)$, the associated rate function is given by

$$I'(\phi)=\begin{cases}\int_0^\infty \lambda(\dot\phi(s))\,ds, & \text{if } \phi \text{ is absolutely continuous.}\\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{5.10}$$

where λ is the Frenchel-Legendre transformation of

$$\mu(x)=\int_U (e^{\sum x_ih_i(u)}-1)\,\nu(du),\quad x=(x_1,\dots,x_m),$$

that is,

$$\lambda(y)=\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m}\left[x\cdot y-\mu(x)\right].$$

Step 3: Put $Y_n(A,t)=(n^{-1}W(A,t),n^{-1/2}\xi(A,nt)$, take the indexing space $\mathbb{H}=(L^2(\mu),M^\Phi(\nu))$ with $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}=\|\cdot\|_2+\|\cdot\|_\Phi$.

Step 4: Since W and ξ_n are independent, $\{Y_n\}$ satisfies a LDP with rate function $I''=I+I'$. Moreover $\{Y_n\}$ satisfies the UET condition as evident from Examples 3.2 and 3.3.

Step 5: Similar to Examples 5.3 and 5.5, Itô's formula and Gronwall's inequality prove that $E(\exp(n|X_n(t+h)-X_n(t)|))=O(e^{Cnh})$. This verifies the exponential tightness of the solution. As before, Theorem 5.2 gives the associated rate function for $\{X_n\}$.

REMARK 5.7. *In the above example, the conditions on σ_1,σ_2 and b can be relaxed. Suppose that $\{X_n\}$ satisfies the exponential compact containment condition. Suppose that the mappings*

$$x\in\mathbb{R}^d\longrightarrow F(x,\cdot)\in L^2(\mu),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d\longrightarrow b(x)\in\mathbb{R}^d$$

are bounded on compacts (in particular continuous). Let $T>0$. Fix an $a>0$. Since $\{X_n\}$ satisfies the exponential compact containment condition find a compact set $K_{T,a}$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}P\left\{X_n(s)\notin K_{T,a},\ \textit{for some}\ \ s\le T\right\}\le -a. \tag{5.11}$$

Define

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t > 0 : X_n(t) \notin K_{T,a}\}.$$

Then notice that calculations similar to Step 3 of Example 5.5 would prove exponential tightness for $\{X_n(\cdot \wedge \tau_n)\}$*. Next*

$$P\left\{w'(X_n, \delta, T) > \epsilon\right\} \leq P\left\{w'(X_n(\cdot \wedge \tau_n), \delta, T) > \epsilon, \tau_n > T\right\} + P\left\{X_n(s) \notin K_{T,a}, \text{ for some } \ s \leq T\right\}$$

Since $\{X_n(\cdot \wedge \tau_n)\}$ *is exponentially tight, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P\left\{w'(X_n(\cdot \wedge \tau_n), \delta, T) > \epsilon\right\} = -\infty.$$

Now using (5.11) and the fact that $\log(a+b) \leq \log 2 + \log a \vee \log b$ *it follows that*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} P\left\{w'(X_n, \delta, T) > \epsilon\right\} \leq -a.$$

Since this is true for all a*, we are done.*

Remark 5.8. *Example 4.23 of [13] gives criteria on the coefficients of (5.8) for* $\{X_n\}$ *to satisfy exponential compact containment condition.*

5.2. $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^{\#}$*-semimartingale.*

We end the paper by generalizing Theorem 5.2 to $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^{\#}$-semimartingale so that the solution of the corresponding stochastic differential equation is infinite-dimensional.

Theorem 5.9. *Let* $\mathbb{H}$ *be a separable Banach space and* $\{(\phi_k, p_k)\}$ *a pseudo-basis of* $\mathbb{H}$ *satisfying (ii) of Theorem A.13. Let* $\{Y_n\}$ *be a sequence of uniformly exponentially tight* $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}$*-adapted,* $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^{\#}$*-semimartingales,* $\{X_n\}$ *a sequence of cadlag, adapted* $\mathbb{L}$*-valued processes and* $\{U_n\}$ *a sequence of adapted* $\mathbb{L}$*-valued cadlag processes. Suppose* $\{(U_n, Y_n\}$ *satisfies large deviation principle with the rate function family* $\{I_\beta(\cdot,\cdot)\}$*. Assume that* $F, F_n : \mathbb{L} \to \widehat{\mathbb{H}}$ *are measurable functions such that*

- *for all* x *whenever* $x_n \to x$*,* $F_n(x_n) \to F(x)$*.*

Suppose that X_n *satisfies*

$$X_n(t) = U_n(t) + F_n(X_{n-}) \cdot Y_n(t).$$

For $y \in D_{\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$*, define* $\mathbf{y}^*$ *by (4.20). Suppose that for every* $(u, y) \in D_{\mathbb{L}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$ *for which* $I_\alpha(u, y) < \infty$*, the solution to*

$$x = u + F(x) \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$$

is unique. Assume further that $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n)\}$ *is exponentially tight. Then the sequence* $\{(U_n, X_n, Y_n(\alpha, \cdot))\}$ *satisfies a LDP in* $D_{\mathbb{L}\times\mathbb{L}\times\mathbb{R}^\infty}[0,\infty)$ *with the rate function given by*

$$J_\alpha(u, x, y) \quad = \begin{cases} I_\alpha(u, y), & x = u + F(x) \cdot \mathbf{y}^*, \quad \mathbf{y}^* \in \mathcal{D}. \\ \infty, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

The proof follows almost the exact same route as that of Theorem 5.1.

APPENDIX

A.1. A generalized contraction principle.

Theorem A.1. *Let (E, r) and (E', r') be two complete, separable metric spaces. Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of random vectors taking values in E. Suppose that $\{X_n\}$satisfies a large deviation principle with the good rate function I. Assume that $f, f_n : E \to E'$ are measurable functions satisfying:*

- *for all $x \in E$ with $I(x) < \infty$, $x_n \to x$ implies that $f_n(x_n) \to f(x)$.*

Then $\{f_n(X_n)\}$ satisfies a large deviation principle with the rate function given by

$$I'(y) = \inf\{I(x) : f(x) = y\}.$$

See Theorem 2.4 [17].

A.2. Orlicz spaces. The standard reference for this section is Rao and Ren [29] . Some results presented here are taken from Terrence Tao's lecture notes on Harmonic Analysis [33].

Let U be a complete and separable metric space, and $\mathcal{U}$ a σ-algebra on U. Observe that for the space $L^p(U, \mu), 1 \le p < \infty$,

$$\|f\|_p \le 1 \text{ iff } \int_U |f|^p \, d\mu \le 1.$$

The motivation for introducing Orlicz spaces is to find more general function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying certain conditions, such that the above kind of statement is true, that is we want to find a norm $\|f\|_\Phi$ such that

$$\|f\|_\Phi \le 1 \text{ iff } \int_U \phi(|f|) \, d\mu \le 1.$$

Definition A.2. *Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be an even, increasing and convex function with $\Phi(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{x\to\infty} \Phi(x) = \infty$. Such a Φ is called a* **Young's function***.*

Define the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Phi$ by

$$\|f\|_\Phi \equiv \inf\left\{A > 0 : \int_U \Phi(|f|/A) \, d\mu \le 1\right\}.$$

$\|\cdot\|_\Phi$ is called the **Orlicz norm***, and the corresponding space*

$$L^\Phi(U, \mu) \equiv \{f : \|f\|_\Phi < \infty\}$$

is called the **Orlicz space***.*

Lemma A.3. *Orlicz spaces are Banach spaces.*

The following are a few examples of Orlicz spaces.

- $L^p(U, \mu)$ forms an Orlicz space for $1 \le p < \infty$, with $\Phi(x) = |x|^p$.
- The spaces $L^\Phi(U, \mu)$ with $\Phi(x) \equiv e^x - 1$, or $\Phi(x) = x \log(x + 2)$.

Observe that

$$L^\Phi(U, \mu) = \left\{f : \int \Phi(af) \, d\mu < \infty, \quad \text{for some} \quad a > 0\right\}.$$

Let

$$M^{\Phi}(U,\mu) = \left\{ f : \int \Phi(af)\, d\mu < \infty, \quad \text{for all} \quad a > 0 \right\} \tag{A.1}$$

The space $M^{\Phi}(U,\mu)$ was introduced by Morse and Transue (1950), and is sometimes refered to as **Morse-Transue space** [29].

Lemma A.4. *Let Φ be a continuous Young's function. Then $M^{\Phi}(U,\mu)$ is a closed linear subspace of $L^{\Phi}(U,\mu)$.*

In general, not many Orlicz spaces other than L^p-spaces will be separable. However, for M^{Φ}, we have the following theorem (Page 87, [29]):

Lemma A.5. *Let $(U,\mathcal{U})$ be a complete measure space, and Φ a continuous Young's function with $\Phi(x) = 0$ iff $x = 0$. Then the space $M^{\Phi}(U,\mu)$ is separable.*

A.3. Basis theory.

The material presented here is taken from [21, 31, 32].

Definition A.6. *A sequence $\{x_k\}$ in a Banach space B is a* **basis** *for B if for each $x \in B$, there exist unique scalars $p_k(x)$, such that*

$$x = \sum_k p_k(x) x_k.$$

Remark A.7. *Every Banach space with a basis is separable.*

Remark A.8. *It is easy to see that the p_n are linear functionals.*

Definition A.9. *A basis $\{x_k\}$ is called a* **Schauder basis** *if the unique p_k are bounded linear functionals, that is if $p_k \in X^*$ for every n.*

Theorem A.10. *Every basis $\{x_k\}$ of X is a Schauder basis, that is, the p_k are bounded linear functionals.*

Example A.11. *Every separable Orlicz space (hence L^p space) has a Schauder basis. Every separable Hilbert space has a Schauder basis given by its complete orthonormal system.*

The notion of a basis of a Banach space is generalized to that of *pseudo-basis* defined below.

Definition A.12. *A sequence $\{x_k\}$ in a Banach space B with $x_k \neq 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ is a* **pseudo-basis** *if for every $x \in B$, there exists a sequence of scalars $\{p_k\}$ such that*

$$x = \sum_k p_k x_k. \tag{A.2}$$

Theorem A.13. *[32] Let B be a separable Banach space.*

(i) *Then B has a pseudo-basis.*

(ii) *Every sequence* $\{x_k\}$ *with* $x_k \neq 0, k = 1, \dots,$ *which is dense in* $\{x \in B : \|x\| \leq 1\}$ *is a pseudo-basis of* B*. For every such sequence* $\{x_k\}$*, there exists a subset* $\mathcal{L}$ *of* l^1 *with the following property: for every* $x \in B$ *there exists a unique sequence of scalars* $\{p_k(x)\}$ *such that (A.2) is satisfied and the mapping*

$$x \to \{p_k(x)\}$$

is a homeomorphism of E *onto* $\mathcal{L}$*.*

Remark A.14. *In partcular, the above theorem implies that for each* k*, the mapping* $x \to p_k(x)$ *is continuous. If* $\{x_k\}$ *is a basis, then the* p_k *are also linear, hence* $p_k \in B^*, k = 1, 2, \dots.$

Notation: For convenience, we denote a basis or a pseudo-basis of B by $\{(x_k, p_k)\}$.

A.4. A compactness lemma.

Lemma A.15. *Let* B *be a separable Banach space with pseudo-basis* $\{(x_k, p_k)\}$ *satisfying ((ii)) of Theorem A.13. Define a sequence of continuous functions* $\{S_n\}$ *by*

$$S_n(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p_k(x) x_n.$$

Then $S_n \to I$ *uniformly on compacts, that is, for every compact set* $C \subset B$

$$\sup_{x \in C} \|S_n(x) - x\| \to 0.$$

Proof. Let $C \subset B$ be compact. Let T denote the mapping

$$x \in B \to \{p_k(x)\} \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Note that by Theorem A.13, $T(C) \subset \mathcal{L}$ is also compact. Fix an $\epsilon > 0$. Define the open sets $O_n \subset \mathcal{L}$ by

$$O_n = \left\{ \{c_k\} \in l^1 : \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} |c_j| < \epsilon \right\}. \tag{A.3}$$

Notice that the O_n are increasing and $T(C) \subset \cup_n O_n$. Since $T(C)$ is compact, there exists an $N > 0$, such that $T(C) \subset \cup_{j=1}^{N} O_j = O_N$. It follows using ((ii)) of Theorem A.13 that if $n > N$, then $\|S_n(x) - x\| < \epsilon$, for all $x \in C$. ☐

A.5. Integration with respect to vector-valued functions. Suppose $\mathbb{X}$ is a Banach space, and $x \in D_{\mathbb{X}}[0, \infty)$. Suppose $\mathbf{y}^* \in D_{\mathbb{X}^*}[0, \infty)$ is of finite variation in the sense that $T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) < \infty$, for all $t > 0$, where the total variation $T_t(\mathbf{y}^*)$ is defined as

$$T_t(\mathbf{y}^*) = \sup_{\sigma} \sum_i \|\mathbf{y}^*(t_i) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i-1})\|_{\mathbb{X}^*},$$

$\sigma \equiv \{t_i\}_i$ varying over all partitions of $[0, t)$.

Define the integral $x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$ by

$$x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*(t) = \lim_{\|\sigma\| \to 0} \sum_i \langle x(t_i), \mathbf{y}^*(t_{i+1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_i) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}^*}, \tag{A.4}$$

$\|\sigma\|$ denoting the mesh of the partition $\sigma \equiv \{t_i\}_i$. Here $\langle h, h^* \rangle_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}^*} = h^*(h)$ for $h \in \mathbb{X}, h^* \in \mathbb{X}^*$.

Lemma A.16. *The limit in (A.4) exists.*

Proof. For $\sigma \equiv \{t_i\}_i$, denote

$$x^\sigma(t) = \sum_i x(t_i) 1_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(t).$$

And notice that for a finer partition δ,

$$|(x^\sigma - x^\delta) \cdot \mathbf{y}^*| \leq \int_0^t \|x^\sigma(s) - x^\delta(s)\|_{\mathbb{X}} dT_s(\mathbf{y}^*) \leq \sup_{s \leq t} \|x^\sigma(s) - x^\delta(s)\|_{\mathbb{X}} T_t(\mathbf{y}^*).$$

It follows that $\{x^\sigma \cdot \mathbf{y}^*(t)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and we are done. □

More generally, we can allow the integrands to take values in some operator space, so that the integral is infinite-dimensional. Let $\mathbb{Y}$ be a Banach space, and suppose that $x \in D_{L(\mathbb{X}^*, \mathbb{Y})}[0, \infty)$. Define the integral $x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$ by

$$x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*(t) = \lim_{\|\sigma\| \to 0} \sum_i x(t_i) \circ (\mathbf{y}^*(t_{i+1}) - \mathbf{y}^*(t_i)), \tag{A.5}$$

$\|\sigma\|$ denoting the mesh of the partition $\sigma \equiv \{t_i\}_i$. Here for $S \in L(\mathbb{X}^*, \mathbb{Y})$ and $x \in \mathbb{X}^*$, $S \circ x = S(x)$. The proof of the existence of the limit is same as that of Lemma A.16. Notice that $x \cdot \mathbf{y}^*$ takes values in $\mathbb{Y}$. We end by noting that the above integrals are just special (deterministic) cases of integrals with respect to $(\mathbb{L}, \widehat{\mathbb{H}})^{\#}$-semimartingales.

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank my advisor Prof. Tom Kurtz for his numerous advice and comments throughout the preparation of the paper.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Azencott. Grandes déviations et applications. In *Eighth Saint Flour Probability Summer School—1978 (Saint Flour, 1978)*, volume 774 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–176. Springer, Berlin, 1980.

[2] Amarjit Budhiraja, Paul Dupuis, and Vasileios Maroulas. Large deviations for infinite dimensional stochastic dynamical systems. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(4):1390–1420, 2008.

[3] Nhansook Cho. Large deviation principle for diffusion processes in a conuclear space. *Commun. Korean Math. Soc.*, 20(2):381–393, 2005.

[4] Nhansook Cho. Large deviation principle for solutions to SDE driven by martingale measure. *Commun. Korean Math. Soc.*, 21(3):543–558, 2006.

[5] A. de Acosta. Large deviations for vector-valued Lévy processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 51(1):75–115, 1994.

[6] A. de Acosta. Exponential tightness and projective systems in large deviation theory. In *Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam*, pages 143–156. Springer, New York, 1997.

[7] Amir Dembo and Ofer Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*, volume 38 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[8] Jean-Dominique Deuschel and Daniel W. dupuis. *Large deviations*, volume 137 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics.* Academic Press Inc., 1989.

[9] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time. I. II. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 28:1–47; ibid. 28 (1975), 279–301, 1975.

[10] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time. III. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 29(4):389–461, 1976.

[11] Paul Dupuis and Richard S. Ellis. *A weak convergence approach to the theory of large deviations.* Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1997. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

[12] Stewart N. Ethier and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Markov processes*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1986. ISBN 0-471-08186-8. Characterization and convergence.

[13] Jin Feng and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Large deviations for stochastic processes*, volume 131 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006. ISBN 978-0-8218-4145-7; 0-8218-4145-9.

[14] Wendell H. Fleming. Exit probabilities and optimal stochastic control. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 4(4):329–346, 1977/78.

[15] Wendell H. Fleming. A stochastic control approach to some large deviations problems. In *Recent mathematical methods in dynamic programming (Rome, 1984)*, volume 1119 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 52–66. Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[16] M. I. Freidlin and A. D. Wentzell. *Random perturbations of dynamical systems*, volume 260 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984. Translated from the Russian by Joseph Szücs.

[17] J. Garcia. An extension of the contraction principle. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 17(2):403–434, 2004.

[18] Jorge Garcia. A large deviation principle for stochastic integrals. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 21(2):476–501, 2008.

[19] I. I. Gihman and A. V. Skorohod. *The theory of stochastic processes. III.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979. Translated from the Russian by Samuel Kotz, With an appendix containing corrections to Volumes I and II, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 232.

[20] Mathieu Gourcy. Large deviation principle of occupation measure for stochastic Burgers equation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 43(4):441–459, 2007.

[21] Christopher Heil. Basis theory primer. 1997. URL `http://people.math.gatech.edu/~heil/papers/`.

[22] Naresh Jain and Nicolai Krylov. Large deviations for occupation times of Markov processes with L_2 semigroups. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(5):1611–1641, 2008.

[23] A. Jakubowski, J. Mémin, and G. Pagès. Convergence en loi des suites d'intégrales stochastiques sur l'espace $\mathbf{D}^1$ de Skorokhod. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 81(1):111–137, 1989.

[24] Thomas G. Kurtz and Philip E. Protter. Weak convergence of stochastic integrals and differential equations. II. Infinite-dimensional case. In *Probabilistic models for nonlinear partial differential equations (Montecatini Terme, 1995)*, volume 1627 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 197–285. Springer, Berlin, 1996.

[25] Liangzhen Lei. Large deviations in total variation of occupation measures of one-dimensional diffusions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(7):2387–2399, 2009.

[26] Michel Métivier and Jean Pellaumail. *Stochastic integration*. Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, 1980. ISBN 0-12-491450-0. Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

[27] George L. O'Brien and Wim Vervaat. Compactness in the theory of large deviations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 57(1):1–10, 1995.

[28] A. A. Pukhalskii. On the theory of large deviations. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 38(3):553–562, 1993.

[29] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren. *Theory of Orlicz spaces*, volume 146 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1991.

[30] Raymond A. Ryan. *Introduction to tensor products of Banach spaces*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag London Ltd., London, 2002.

[31] Ivan Singer. *Bases in Banach spaces. I.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 154.

[32] Ivan Singer. *Bases in Banach spaces. II.* Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, Bucharest, 1981. ISBN 3-540-10394-5.

[33] Terrence Tao. Lecture notes on Fourier analysis. URL `http://www.math.ucla.edu/~tao/247a.1.06f/`.

[34] S. Ustunel. Stochastic integration on nuclear spaces and its applications. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. B (N.S.)*, 18(2):165–200, 1982.

[35] S. R. S. Varadhan. Asymptotic probabilities and differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 19:261–286, 1966.

[36] A. D. Ventcel and M. I. Freidlin. Small random perturbations of dynamical systems. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 25(1 (151)):3–55, 1970.

[37] John B. Walsh. An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations. In *École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XIV—1984*, volume 1180 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 265–439. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

ARNAB GANGULY
AUTOMATIC CONTROL LAB
ETH ZURICH
PHYSIKSTRASSE 3
ZURICH 8092, SWITZERLAND
E-MAIL: gangulya@control.ee.ethz.ch
URL: http://control.ee.ethz.ch/∼gangulya/